DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 437 VT 014 953

AUTHOR	Chin, Robert; And Others
TITLE	Impact upon the Organization of Hiring the Disadvantaged. Report of a Study of Two Companies.
INSTITUTION	Boston Univ., Mass. Human Relations Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
NOTE	267p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Business; Case Studies; Culturally Disadvantaged; Disadvantaged Groups; Employee Attitudes; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Programs; Employment Qualifications; *Manpower Utilization; *Minority Groups; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This study of company programs to employ disadvantaged and minority people is based on the observations of the investigators and on interviews and questionnaire data obtained from the management and employees of two types of business, service and manufacturing. It examines the ways in which organizational processes, organizational relationships, and employee attitudes were affected by different aspects of program implementation, and should enable key personnel in an organization to anticipate and understand the problems and benefits of such programs. The report describes management and employee forces which initiated and influenced the development of the programs, the nature of their implementation and development, the consequences of events which occurred, and changes in attitudes of company personnel. Recommendations for development and management of such programs are also presented. (Author/BH)

ED 061 437

IMPACT UPON THE ORGANIZATION OF HIRING THE DISADVANTAGED

Report of a Study of Two Companies

Boston University
Human Relations Center

Robert Chin
with
L. Irving Pollitt
Herschel N. Hadley

VT014953

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under Research Contract No. 51-23-70-04 authorized by the Social Security Act. Since contractors performing research under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely, the report does not necessarily represent the department's official opinion and policy. Moreover, the contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in this report.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IMPACT UPON THE ORGANIZATION OF HIRING THE DISADVANTAGED

Report of a Study of Two Companies

Boston University

Human Relations Center

Robert Chin

with

L. Irving Pollitt

Herschel N. Hadley

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under Research Contract No. 51-23-70-04 authorized by the Social Security Act. Since contractors performing research under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely, the report does not necessarily represent the department's official opinion and policy. Moreover, the contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in this report.

ABSTRACT

This is a study of the impact of company programs to employ disadvantaged and minority people on the organization itself. It examines the ways in which organizational processes, organizational relationships, and employee attitudes were affected by different aspects of program implementation. Understanding of these factors should enable key personnel in an organization to anticipate and understand the problems and benefits that are likely to arise when they make concerted efforts to open new opportunities to a group of high visibility who differ in certain ways from traditional employees. The report describes management and employee forces which initiated and influenced the development of the programs; the nature of their implementation and development; the consequences of events which occurred; and changes in attitudes of company personnel. Recommendations for development and management of such programs are also presented.

The study is based upon the observations of the investigators and upon interviews and questionnaire data obtained from the management and employees of two types of business: a service and a manufacturing organization.

IMPACT UPON THE ORGANIZATION OF HIRING THE DISADVANTAGED

Table of Contents

Page

Preface i

Implications and Conclusions iii

PART I: OVERVIEW

Introduction 1

Section 1: Discussion of Conclusions, Recommendations and Findings 2

Section 2: Research and Development Workshop: A Recommended Methodology 15

PART II: THE STUDY

Section 1: Framework of Study 18

Section 2: Company Case Histories 28

Service Company 28

Manufacturing Company 38

Transportation Company 71

Section 3: Questionnaire Responses: Organizational Changes and Attitudes 73

PART III: APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire and Activity Scale Forms 80

Appendix 2: The Activity Scale and Activity Index 85

Appendix 3: Tabulations of Selected Questionnaire Data 99

Appendix 4: Analyses of Questionnaire Data and Activity Indices 251

Appendix 5: Description of Sample and Methodology 256

PREFACE

The opportunity to undertake a study of how companies are affected by bringing in more disadvantaged, that is, blacks and other minorities was seen by us as fitting the contours of our personal and professional interests, counterbalancing other studies which focused on disadvantaged persons, and contributing to understanding how planned change unfolds.

The job sector of American society is now accepting the challenge of making more and better jobs available for minorities and disadvantaged. In shouldering this responsibility, there has been both an eagerness and a timidity in finding the forms and procedures for moving ahead. And, from the sponsors of such programs, there has been a search for concrete reasons why industry and commerce should undertake the task as well as inquiry about the consequences to be managed and the organizational benefits.

The present study is an attempt to describe how hiring, retention, and promotion of disadvantaged persons is affected by the patterns of the organization, and how changes of these patterns are brought about. In undertaking the study it was immediately recognized that descriptive case studies, that is a more intensive investigation of a few companies, would be more helpful for understanding the processes than mass or statistical studies of many companies. The objective of this study, then, is to plumb and investigate. It is to derive and create frameworks for furthering the employment and retention of people by raising some suggestions and recommendations, and to create hypotheses for systematic verification in later studies of a larger number and more varied groups of companies.

Interviews were conducted with individuals and groups supplemented by a questionnaire administered to both interviewees and to other personnel. The companies studied were selected on several criteria. First, they had a vigorous set of activities and programs for hiring and promoting. Second, there was personal commitment of the top executive to these programs. Third, there was an active group of specialists working to facilitate organizational change and personnel training in the company. Fourth, the company was sufficiently large to assure a complex organization for study. An operational factor that affects our conclusions is, of course, the fact of the company's willingness to be studied which indicated an organizational stance towards openness of communication.

The degree of precise delineation of focus is affected by these objectives. There is an inherent sprawliness in both the report form and in the observations themselves. Organizing these ideas more concisely would have meant the loss of context and nuances. This we were not willing to do.

A word about the staff of the study. Robert Chin, Professor of Psychology, Boston University, was the Project Director. L. Irving Pollitt of Pollitt-Alban, Consultant, worked on direct investigation of the service company. Herschel N. Hadley, Research Associate, worked on coordinating project activities with special attention to the manufacturing company. Other personnel contributing to the study were: Yoichi Satow, Joanne Aarons, Clarice Sackett, and the interviewers -- Irvin Robinson, John Carrington, Robert Jacobs, Paul Campanis, John Tabor, Constance Williams, Curtis White, James Howard, John Armstrong, Walter Isaacs, Verna Brookins, and Arakel Almasian.

The pleasure of working with liaison people from the companies studied made the study a satisfying mutual exploration. From the very beginning people from the companies were collaborative and participative. We met with candor and honesty which was most rewarding and fruitful.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Below are brief summaries of the implications and our conclusions. The number following each item indicates the section in which it is discussed more fully.

Persons who manage the activities of hiring, retaining, and promoting disadvantaged and minority personnel need to operate out of a broad conceptual framework that sees individual and group behavior in terms of organizational processes rather than being restricted to narrow problems of manpower supply. (Part I, Section 1.0)

Persons responsible for meaningful manpower development programs should utilize methods of applied behavioral science to help companies assess their readiness to undertake such programs. (Part I, Section 1.1)

Management's awareness of, commitment to, and skill in achieving a healthy balance of "people development" in production tasks is crucial to the success of manpower programs. (Part I, Section 1.2)

Managers should recognize the three stages of a manpower program: releasing and initiating action, developing methods to facilitate adjustment to new conditions, and establishing new organizational norms and practices. (Part I, Section 1.3)

Strong, unequivocal leadership is required which at the same time encourages line management responsibility for and ownership of the programs. (Part I, Section 1.4)

Strong efforts must be made to develop values and attitudes which favor direct social action by industry including selection and education of personnel. (Part I, Section 1.5)

Persons responsible for planning and implementing manpower programs must realize that "success" of such programs requires a time span measured in years not weeks or months. (Part I, Section 1.6)

Planning and implementation of manpower programs should encourage changes in communication patterns which provide for: a) communication among disadvantaged and minority employees, b) communication between groups of disadvantaged and minorities and with other groups both formal and informal, c) "shunting" channels to expedite and enlarge communication, and d) coping with resistance to new communication patterns. (Part I, Section 1.7)

Information systems and monitoring procedures should be established to encourage self management by persons responsible toward achievement of their specific manpower goals. (Part I, Section 1.8)

Personal commitment to the values and goals of the programs by middle and lower management is essential. (Part I, Section 1.9)

Supervisory level employees need more training and assistance in order to understand the goals of the program, to develop ways to cope with new situations, and to get clear messages on criteria by which their achievement will be judged. (Part I, Section 1.10)

Training for supervisors which increases their skills in understanding and managing people and organizational issues probably is more productive than intensive personal encounter or confrontation training. (Part I, Section 1.11)

All groups or organizations of influence with a stake in the programs should be early and constant partners in the planning and management of such programs. (Part I, Section 1.12)

The values of the organization, as perceived by employees and management, must be consistent with goals of the special programs. (Part I, Section 1.13)

Programs must provide for continued development of new employees beyond their entry and, for companies with limited advancement potential, this will require collaborative programs with other companies. (Part I, Section 1.14)

To provide the necessary involvement, participation, and influence, informal management systems must be encouraged and strengthened. (Part I, Section 1.15)

Intercultural workshops, encounter training, and similar kinds of training can be effective if they are offered on the basis of voluntary participation and at a time when they respond to employees' needs. (Part I, Section 1.16)

Dependable information systems which provide data about current decisions are essential for supervisory effectiveness as well as aiding others to develop organization identity and role. (Part I, Section 1.17)

Programs for minority and disadvantaged persons which encourage their commitment and participation can be an important resource to increase awareness and initiative for change at all organization levels and generate processes and practices of benefit to all employees. The scope and limitations of this study and data upon which conclusions and recommendations are based are noted on page 1.

PART I: OVERVIEW

Introduction

The findings of this study are derived from the observations and judgements of the research staff, from interviews of persons in the organizations studied, and from quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires. In order to cast these into statements that have useful implications for the management of activities and programs for hiring and retaining disadvantaged, especially blacks, we have stated these findings as categorically as warranted, and, at times, beyond the data, in order to sharpen the implications of our suggestions and recommendations.

Recommendations for policy differ from recommendations for practices. In the former, broad principles are the mode of policy thinking, generalizing beyond the individual cases and factors. In the recommendations for practices there are many conditional circumstances which restrict generalization. For specific action each practitioner has to analyze his immediate circumstances to determine how the recommended practices can fit the circumstances of his specific case. In keeping with the approach of this report, the recommendations are guidelines rather than detailed operational models.

One further caution. Our observations and data come from perceptions and feelings of persons in the companies studied. Other measures and data of the "objective" variety are not used. An organization is more usefully approached as a set of organization behaviors (activities, feelings, perceptions, attitudes, and values of individuals as well as organizational positions, roles and personalities of individuals). Therefore, we do not think the lack of objective indices lessens the validity of our findings and recommendations for managers.

It may be useful to say a few words about the arrangement of this report. Part I: Overview is present on the level of generality appropriate for conclusions and recommendations. The identification of significant processes, conclusions, and recommendations rests upon the authors' judgements of the meanings of the data. Part II: The Study presents actual data as realistically as possible. This data is organized as Case Histories which focus on various issues that occurred. The conceptual framework of the study and some quantitative data on changes and attitudes toward change are also presented in Part II. The Appendices contain tabulations and analyses of quantitative data from the questionnaires and discussion of methodology of the study.

Thus, each part of the study represents a different level of generality or viewpoint. This provides the reader the latitude to consider each part independently. At the same time this independence has led to a certain amount of repetition in order to enable this choice in level of consideration.

DISCUSSION OF CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS

1.0

Framework: Manpower vs. People-Organization

We see the usefulness, if not the necessity, for managers of a broad framework for managing activities of hiring, retaining, and promoting disadvantaged personnel that looks at individual and group behavior in relation to organizational processes and dynamics.

Managers and supervisors who approached the issues in terms of manpower and manpower supply (numerically defined) were soon enmeshed with problems of persons' behavioral activities in organizational relationships. Numerical manpower concepts became bankrupt in personnel activities. There are many reasons for this.

There are unique factors in hiring and retaining disadvantaged, especially blacks. These factors are: race; heightened visibility of the new employees because of race and color; social attitudes toward racial issues in society; and the very fact of designing and designating special programs and activities for such people.

In addition, blacks act and react with counter-activity, forming special interest groups, for example. They press for fulfillment of the company's social commitment to them. In turn, reaction of employees and managers towards these new activities, sharpened by the rapidity of the change, also contribute to the dynamics. These dynamics are understandable and manageable only within a conceptual framework which goes beyond that of numerical manpower. Managers who comprehend this difference in viewpoint stand a better chance of coping with the issues arising from these activities and programs.

Supervisors who maintain a numerical manpower orientation expect the entry training program to create "just another employee", and are bewildered by the activities that occur. Higher levels of management seem aware of the need for new frameworks. The top executive is often the most acutely aware of this difference. At least, he is more likely to have a philosophical attitude and approach to employees which agrees with the broad set of concepts and practices needed for effective management of activities and programs for disadvantaged and minority people.

1.1

Company Readiness

The federal government and industry should utilize to the fullest extent possible the methods of applied behavioral science to help companies assess, before the fact, the conditions relevant to undertake meaningful manpower development programs for minorities and the disadvantaged.

"Meaningful manpower development programs" includes but goes beyond entry and job-skill training. To be "meaningful" in the sense we use the term, program objectives include developing ways to increase significance, support and security for human resources throughout the company.

The company proposing to undertake manpower development programs based on disadvantaged and/or minority persons might try to demonstrate that its organizational values and processes satisfy such criteria as: openness to new attitudes and ideas, willingness to confront and work with people issues, and desire to change and improve its use of all human resources in order to increase efficiency and productivity.

1.2

People Orientation

There needs to be a recognition that orientation of management to the issues of reconciling production tasks with "people development" is crucial for the success of these programs.

People orientation, in gross contrast to a production task orientation, seems to distinguish the top executives and some of the middle level managers as they approached the issues arising from these programs and activities. Those managers bound up with rules and procedures did not see the programs as successful.

The programs and activities for minorities and disadvantaged increased an orientation towards people both for those already so convinced and for those wavering. In some instances these programs converted task oriented managers into people oriented managers. Some of these conversions occurred as a result of sensitivity training experiences while others occurred from directly working on the issues in day to day operations in the company.

Our estimate is that the major gains for companies participating in the programs is a general increase in

1.2

People Orientation

people orientation, education, emphasis on development of people as part of company policies for training, counselling, upgrading, and promotion. These gains are now available for all employees and managers of the companies.

A minimum or verbal acquiescence at the beginning of activities seemed to be the root seed from which the increased orientation towards people grew, as the benefits available for disadvantaged employees spread to others. Company personnel saw these changes as great boosts to company morale and development of loyalty to the company. It was the deliberate strategy of those in management positions with responsibility for personnel resources that these programs and activities would bring just such benefits (as well as furthering their other programs and roles).

1.3

Stages of Change

In planning programs we suggest that managers should differentiate three stages with different requirements for management activities organizationally at each stage.

This study confirmed our initial hunch that the management of organizational issues played an important part in hiring and retaining the disadvantaged. In the first stage (initiating, launching and loosening up organizational norms and ways of acting) there are four conditions. One is the positive and assertive role of the chief executive in stating a policy position. There is some dramatic event (riots, demonstrations, assassination) which shocks, releases, energizes, and mobilizes the system - in brief, structures the power system. This opportunity is seized by an inside existing or newly formed group of line and/or staff managers similarly concerned with larger goals as well as with other motivations. And there is also an organizational climate for learning and change.

The dynamics of this first stage unfreezes, and structures the energies of the organization, easily overcoming resistance and restraining factors. The quality of prospective trainees and new employees is not a factor at this stage.

In the second stage, we find the quality and attributes of the trainees, their job performance, their adjustment, and assistance provided for adjusting are crucial. There is also interaction between the trainees or new hires and other employees as well as organizational issues such as the quality and kind of communications, the attitudes of supervisors and of fellow employees. For instance, it is axiomatic that if counsellors don't keep in touch with supervisors or fellow employees are adamant in opposing the new person, he will not last long.

1.3 Stages of Change

As this interaction of disadvantaged persons and groups continues, the process of absorption and integration into the norms and informal structures of the company and work units becomes the main issue. It is in this second stage that major organizational issues and changes can no longer be avoided. Changes to make company processes more relevant to new conditions occur. These changes affect promotion and coherency of personnel policy and the status and influence of certain organizational groups. These changes affect both the disadvantaged and others. If these developments do not happen, the tension increases and disadvantaged and minorities leave.

Even when successful alterations of organizations occur, middle and upper groups of the disadvantaged begin the zig and zag process of upward mobility. They move into other jobs at much higher grades in other units both inside and outside the company than are available in the initial unit. In managing this process, most of the managers in our study were glad to see this individual achievement while some had reservations about the competency of the blacks for the new positions they were jumping to. There was also evidence of shuffling off persons unable to fit in. The evidence suggests that this jumping over grade levels is beginning.

Stabilization and reinforcement of the changes, characterizing the third stage occurs with the visible evidence of more black managers, and widespread acceptance of the new educational and training programs (with regular budget lines) serving groups other than minorities. The style and role of person concern by supervisors and managers becomes an accustomed attitude and these are supplemented by learnings about organizational and management processes from the experiences of these activities and programs for the disadvantaged.

1.4 Strategy Inducing Change

We suggest that a vigorous and assertive push by the top executive is the important step in unfreezing the organizational equilibrium. In addition, creating feelings of psychological ownership of the activities and programs by the persons inside, especially line managers, increases the chances of success.

We found vigorous and unequivocal statements and pushes in the launching of new activities. In one company, the chief executive chose to follow a strategy of direct pressure and coercion. The managers were expected to comply with new activities. In two geographically separate units within this company we found two different modes of translating this strategy. In one, there was a firm and clear direction that the norms, values and behaviors in the unit needed changing with the scope not limited to those activities

1.4

Strategy Inducing Change

directly affecting the disadvantaged. In the other unit within the same company we found an attempt to force through a program in a highly resistant situation based on a deeply ingrained pattern of ethnic separation and control over work jobs. The attempts at re-education through use of confrontation sessions proved unsuccessful.

In the other company there was also the vigorous announcement by the top executive of a social value broadly stated. These statements were turned into policies and procedures stated as values and goals rather than rules. In so doing each high and middle manager, along with whomever was interested, could operate with self-constructed solutions, many of them ingeniously improvised. With the development or evolution of a widespread problem-solving orientation personal ownership of pieces and parts of the activities and programs was achieved.

1.5

Attitude Toward Change

It is difficult to suggest a recommendation in this area since the attitude or value system governing one's views of appropriate corrective change for a social problem may be less susceptible to modification. Views on corrective change of social problems and the desired role and responsibility of industry for these changes may be altered either by education and value re-orientation or by selection of those who demonstrate their agreement with these views.

In the scale of positions reflecting seven possible ways in which action or no action should be undertaken by industry (Activity Scale, see Appendix 2), we found a positive association between the positions taken and the amount of gains or benefits respondents saw from these programs. Middle and higher levels of management took a position of accepting greater responsibility by industry to rectify social ills, even to the extent of being "unfair" to other employees. Eight percent preferred "equal representation" as the definition of what should be done during the present decade. It is noteworthy that only eight people out of forty (seven of whom were from the manufacturing company) were willing to rank as first preference the item encouraging "reverse discrimination" in favor of blacks. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents accepted no industry responsibility for social change. They chose items representing "early education" or "hard work alone" as preferred ways of dealing with the problems. About twenty percent preferred "special programs in industry" for minority groups. Quite obviously, "equal opportunity" for minorities and disadvantaged take on different meanings when translated into action.

1.6

Time Span

Planning programs for minorities and disadvantaged should include careful assessment of the realistic time span required to accomplish human and social objectives.

The objective of increasing individual skill levels can be accomplished by work-training programs with a duration of, say, six to twelve months. The "success" of such programs would be measured (like literacy programs) by assessing the overall, society-wide benefit of increasing the level of resources available.

Accomplishment of the larger objective of incorporating minority and disadvantaged persons as functioning, contributing and secure elements in an organization requires a time span of, say, at least three to four years and probably longer. Success of such a program would be measured by the extent to which, in addition to learning new skills, minority and disadvantaged persons were retained by the organization and gained influence and participated in the organization's culture. The changes in organizational patterns and processes necessary to retain a significant number of these new employees (changes in seniority procedures, for example), and changes in performance standards, promotion criteria, and processes necessary to effect advancement for minority and disadvantaged persons would require multiple approaches the results of which would take considerable time to come to fruition. Changing individual attitudes and behaviors as well as the organizational norms and practices which permit individual change is accomplished only by continuous effort for an extended period.

In terms of the federal government, this recommendation means developing programs (and funding processes) which provide support over several fiscal years. It also means a deeper commitment to change shared by all parties and requires processes for renewal of commitment as the program develops. In our bandwagon culture favoring quick reaction and instant solutions, long term commitment is a difficult goal to achieve.

All these factors call for programs that are more flexible, evolving, and less structured in advance, than is required for a skills training program essentially unconcerned with further development of the organizational culture and of the individual.

1.7

Communication

We recommend that managers plan for changes in internal communications which:

a. recognize the necessity for communication of groups of minority employees among themselves (both hourly and professional),

1.7

Communication

b. acknowledge the utility of a liaison mechanism for communication between minority and other groups including those in the formal system,

c. foster the possibility of "shunting" procedures whereby communications can flow up and down and also laterally in a mode different from official channels and, at times, more rapidly than with established procedures, and

d. prepare for resistance by supervisors and employees demanding elimination of such "shunt" or "by-pass" channels, and at times (especially onset of programs) demanding comparable opportunities.

Development of "shunting" or "by-pass" mechanisms for communication requires definition of some limits or guidelines for the process. Management might consider, as a first stage, fostering these channels in the informal system, recognizing their existence and the time needed to develop these channels; and, at a later point, consider how these channels and groupings can be integrated into more regular channels, groupings, and roles of the organization.

When the disadvantaged, both entry level people and professional, are scattered through the company, their isolation does not allow for effective management of suspicions through usual channels of actual or alleged grievances frequently seen as based on race. Without this management, these suspicions fester and proliferate. Development of communication channels among blacks allows for sustaining morale, mutual support, and open examination of fairness and unfairness feelings. In addition, the societal context of seeing "brothers and sisters" get together to help each other, while it furthers personal ambition and performance , is also a strong motivation for increasing effective performance of all. For example, in one of the companies studied, there was a strong group, herein called the Black Group, which took on responsibility for "inter-cultural communication" seen as a two way channel between management groups and the disadvantaged workers especially the new hires. They also acted as a channel where employees had a place and specific persons to whom to express their grievance which they felt would not be understood or dealt with fairly by the regular procedures available to all employees. This feeling seemed to arise because their grievances took on a racial slant as far as the black employees were concerned. A side benefit of such a black employee group was that it became a training ground for able black administrators to gain experience in company-wide operations, and in handling the resolution of conflict between task and production needs and requirements

1.7

Communication

of people development. At the same time management gained a front group who could interpret the company and its decisions to disadvantaged employees. While originally seen as helping to explain black cultural behavior to managers, supervisors, and workers, the Black Group became an active force in reacting to and proposing various alternative solutions to issues, such as transfers and layoffs. The ability of the Black Group to perform its liaison role depended upon an acceptance, obviously, by supervisors and managers, sometimes based upon legitimacy given by the Divsion Managers, and sometimes without such legitimacy or authorization. Its nurturing bed included individuals in the corporate personnel and human relations division of the company and their counterparts in each division.

In several instances while our survey was underway, there were instances of some of the disadvantaged taking the chief executive at his word, and demanding an audience for grievance, especially about promotion. The ensuing discussions brought about a by-passing of regular communication channels. In fact, while these episodes were more dramatic examples of by-pass and shunting of communication, we feel that such shunting and by-pass of regular channels of communication was one of the primary changes occurring in the company. Astute top managers who were aware of this phenomena were relatively helpless to stop it, but valiantly tried to keep the by-passed group informed. Middle managers and supervisors were the ones most hard hit by being cut off from the communication flow. Overall, however, we judged that gains in managing these early stages of adjustment by utilizing these shunt mechanisms of communication were worth the difficulty and additional stress placed upon middle levels of the organization.

Seventy-four percent of the service company and sixty percent of the manufacturing company respondents saw communications as "better" in their companies while seven and ten percent respectively saw communication as "worse" as a result of activities and programs in hiring the disadvantaged. When queried about "talking to higher management" the percentages are about in the same proportion. (see Section 5.0).

1.8

Achievement Feedback System

We recommend establishment of information systems and procedures which induce self management toward achieving goals. The information system must give periodic and recurring data on unit performance in hiring, retaining and promoting minorities and disadvantaged persons.

Goal accomplishment by the organization requires information feedback about increases and changes in the

1.8

Achievement Feedback System

presence of disadvantaged at various levels and in various categories. One of the successful mechanisms we found was that of creating a periodic personnel computer printout that showed personnel figures in terms of race and other groups. As each special training program was created, or in almost all personnel actions, the factor of race and of other groups was displayed. These printouts went to the divisional manager and his supervisors, along with the personel specialists, and other interested groups. The monitoring of achievement was a primary responsibility of the line manager. Because the data were available in useable form, he could look at performance figures on personnel hiring, upgradings, training, and so forth as part of his regular review of accomplishments.

The fact that these figures were available elsewhere in the personnel and human relations office, in higher echelons, in black groups, in other employee groups, and so forth, allowed these groups to bring inequities and suggested policy changes to the attention of appropriate persons. The printout provided each manager a means whereby he could plan a program for bringing in people at various levels and could specify the kind of person who would fit into his table of organization as well as being assured of budgetary support. He could lay out a planned program over time showing the stages he wished to use in bringing his division or unit into line with this plan.

Other systems which provide information about trainees ordinarily go only to the training department, the personnel office, or the Program Manager of NAB-JOBS. This information, while it doesn't help the organization participate in planning change, is of assistance in monitoring overall programs. However, such systems leave the locus of responsibility for action uncertain.

While we have no direct data about this point, we would like to point out that such information systems do show individual managers and supervisors the scope of the company wide effort, and thus probably help reduce feelings of victimization.

Such records are also of use in quelling rumors. In the service company, one supervisor away on sick leave, came back to a party for his unit where he saw "lots and lots of black faces" around the punch bowl. To reassure himself, he had to scurry around to find the facts, and see that other units also had black faces. The heightened visibility of black faces often gives rise to exaggerated statements about the number of minority employees on the payroll, and in which division or unit.

1.8 Achievement Feedback System

It appears that there was a strong possibility in the manufacturing company that these records of accomplishment in minority hiring and promotion would become part of the record of the individual manager thus affecting his promotion. However, there gradually grew a feeling that the manager's record in dealing with people in general and his staff was the appropriate framework of judgement to be used in addition to his production and cost record. However, the factual record of the manager in hiring and retaining minorities does become a matter of public knowledge.

While many parts of such programs are not easily reducible to numerical goal statements, the value of using such devices should be understood and, where possible, encouraged.

1.9 Management Commitment

Personal commitment to the programs by lower and middle management is essential.

The "Great Man" can have significant and possibly critical influence in creating a climate for this acceptance and commitment. However, organizations tend to quietly organize themselves against the "Great Man." If the programs become identified as "His" programs, in addition to removing responsibility of other management, energy is spent in criticizing and resisting the programs, albeit in very subtle ways. The programs become external obligations forced upon management in addition to their "regular" jobs.

In the manufacturing company the president performed an essential leadership role in crystallizing the problem of helping minorities and disadvantaged persons and making people realize the necessity to adjust their priorities. Thus the programs became part of each manager's regular responsbilities. In general, this did not seem to occur in the service company.

1.10 Management and Supervisory Assistance

Supervisory levels of the company must be assisted by training programs, devising ways to provide supervisors time for work with people and reduced work loads, and providing clear messages about the criteria on which their achievement of human development goals will be judged.

Middle management and supervisors as a whole were not necessarily more prejudiced than some of the upper levels of management, although in some instances they were. Supervisors complained not as often about the value dilemma and prejudice as about time available and the assistance they needed to work such programs successfully. Supervisors put

1.10

Management and Supervisory Assistance

time into these activities with no compensatory relief from other duties. Time was taken in training and supervising the new person, time was needed for learning about the program, time was required for additional planning and coordinating (including receiving supervisory training), and time was needed when grievance cases arose involving multiple parties. For those managers and supervisors who sincerely engaged in these activities with resulting consumption of additional time, some of their other duties started to be slighted. At the very least, there was less time for the supervisor to be moving around his unit keeping in touch with people and with what was going on.

Among staff people, the equivalent process was going on. Paying special attention to the disadvantaged persons and programs meant that less time was available for other functions. The informal and non-accountable time essential to keep in touch with the organization was diminished or lost because of pressure for spending time on the activities and programs of the disadvantaged.

1.11

Supervisory Training

Training for supervisors aimed at increased skills in understanding and management of people as well as organizational issues is more productive than intensive special personal encounter or confrontation training.

This is not to deny the values of encounter training in some situations. Given a certain level of security, both professional and personal, encounter training can bring worthwhile results as shown by higher level management's reaction to encounter training in the service company.

However, the first priority is to prepare the supervisor and help him gain confidence in his understanding and increase proficiency in skills which enable him to cope with immediate problems. As an addition to this, more specialized training, can then evolve from the supervisor's identification of his own needs and readiness to try new methods of coming to grip with those needs.

1.12

Participative Planning and Management

All groups or organizations of influence with a stake in the programs should be early and constant partners in the planning and management of such programs.

Peer pressures can drive almost anyone out of an organization. In most industrial organizations unions have a great deal of power to organize and influence peer reactions. However, other groupings in the informal management structure also exercise great influence and

1.12 these should be identified and included.

Participative Planning and Management

As the data from the service company indicate, informal direct action can be effective in getting union support. It is at the personal level that this involvement and commitment must be developed not at the negotiating table at the level of power games guarded by legal eagles and formal contracts.

1.13

Consistent Values

The values of the organization as perceived by employees and management must be consistent with goals of the special programs.

An organization whose only values are monetary efficiency and production quantity without consideration of human resources will necessarily exploit such programs for these purposes. Even though the organization is sincerely concerned about human resources, management behavior in pursuing these goals may deny this concern. The means can deny the ends.

The harsh firing of management personnel in Unit B of the service company created great tension and anxiety for both blacks and whites even though many persons could agree with management judgements on individuals who were fired. It was an example where the process used denied the values desired. The result for many was destruction of trust and several valued employees left the organization.

1.14

Collaborative Programs

Industries with a preponderance of low skill jobs do not have resources adequate, by themselves, to carry out meaningful programs for minorities and disadvantaged personnel. Programs in companies with a preponderance of low skill jobs, therefore, should include collaboration with other companies which have jobs of higher level into which persons of minority groups and the disadvantaged can progress.

Programs for minorities and disadvantaged are not adequate if they encompass only the question of entry. The future career advancement of individuals must be a part of the programs. A program is not adequate if it ends with a philosophy of "sink or swim." Trainees will quickly feel trapped and betrayed.

The service company by its very job structure had a preponderance of low skill jobs. Therefore, there was a built in end to the program. The manufacturing

1.14 Collaborative Programs

company has a much wider scope for advancement of minority and disadvantaged persons. The problems of the manufacturing company lie in developing ways to make these opportunities to advancement available to employees brought in by the programs.

1.15 Informal Management Systems

These programs should encourage development of groupings of minority and disadvantaged personnel which offer them the support, encouragement, and influence necessary to have an effect on decisions affecting them.

Significance, support, and security are key needs for all persons and particularly for minority and disadvantaged persons who tend to lack all three. Therefore, companies participating in these programs should be prepared to actively encourage as part of their informal management structure, groups of these new elements which can focus on and reflect their needs. To be effective such groupings must have a piece of the action and not end up serving only as wailing walls with no connections within the management system.

The Black Group in the manufacturing company is an example of the effectiveness of such groupings.

1.16 Voluntary Training

Intercultural workshops, encounter training and similar kinds of training can be effective if they are offered on a voluntary basis at a time when they meet employees needs without forcing people into situations for which they are not ready.

This adds to recommendation 2.12. The consensus in the manufacturing company was that inter-cultural workshops on a voluntary basis had been of value to participants. Concrete evidence of their value came from a marked expansion of this part of the program in response to employees' demands.

1.17 Role-Process Feedback System

Supervisors particularly need regular information systems which feed back to them valid data about current decisions made in specific situations. This information should be designed to make clear the issues, the parties involved, and the decision processes used.

This information feedback is in addition to, not in place of, information obtained through personal, informal sources. It supplements and does not replace the information

1.17

Role- Process Feedback System

function of the informal management system. An illustration is the file of precedents distributed within the manufacturing company. This discussed each case "grieved" in order to make clear the issues, the persons and groups involved, and the decision process.

When his role is changing, in many ways dramatically, a supervisor needs as clear a picture as possible of his organizational identity. To construct this he needs valid data about ongoing organizational processes and shifting forces of influence.

For his needs of immediate action a large part of a supervisor's data for decision must come through direct personal contact. To meet his needs for organizational understanding within which his actions make sense, this direct personal data should be supplemented by official, regularly distributed descriptions of specific situations and processes. These illustrate the issues and meaning of company norms and policies and they way these are changing.

Such information systems are seen as essential for supervisory effectiveness, and they provide similar help in identity and role definition for other persons and thus for the organization as a whole.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP: A RECOMMENDED METHODOLOGY

2.0

Objectives and Phases

We believe an integrated series of research and development workshops can be an effective means to achieve the management commitment, understanding, and operational skills which are critical to the success of programs for employing minorities and disadvantaged persons. The goals of such an approach would be increased understanding of organizational processes, fuller awareness of alternatives, greater appreciation of the complexities of interrelationships that make up the total system, and increased ability to use behavioral science insights in the development, implementation, and management of programs.

The workshops would have five phases. The scope of each phase broadens to include more elements within each company. The objective of the first phase is to identify company conditions essential for success of manpower programs and the changes needed to meet these conditions. The second phase moves to developing specific approaches and managerial skills needed to make the changes productive for the company. The purpose is to develop skills in use of concepts and techniques by which managers can diagnose their own situations. The third phase consists of planning for implementation of programs and

2.0 Objectives and Phases

organizational change. The emphases should be on creating psychological ownership of the programs at different organizational levels. The fourth phase is the management of program activities. The fifth phase provides continuing support by sharing training services among companies and use of outside consultants until companies' commitment to manpower programs and their skill in managing them has made them self sufficient. The purpose of the fifth phase is to help companies sustain and renew program activities as well as to incorporate different viewpoints and approaches.

In considering this workshop, four elements have been selected for discussion: Participation, Methodology, Content, Timing, and Resources.

2.1 Participation

The first and second phases consist of a work group of twenty managers: top, middle, and specialists. These probably should be drawn from at least three different companies but within the same type of industry to facilitate sharing ideas and practices. Participants in the third and fourth phases would include all levels of the company and represent all persons who would be affected by program for minorities and the disadvantaged. The fifth phase moves to use of consultants working with various levels and particular aspects of the programs as required.

2.2 Methodology

The general approach is one of participative research and development applied to organizational and interpersonal processes at all levels. During the first phase attention would focus on learnings, from research studies and individual experiences, which provide criteria for assessing and maximizing gains in organizational health desired. Participants would increase their awareness of alternative organizational patterns and behaviors as well as their costs and benefits. The second phase would use learning technologies which utilize direct, first-hand experience of participants. These would make explicit the values, assumptions, and concerns of individual companies and managers and the relation of these to specific issues.

The design of the third and fourth phases would include appropriate mechanisms for such processes as experimentation, feedback of results, confrontation, cooperative problem-solving, and conceptualization. Similar methodologies would be used during the fifth phase.

2.3

Content

The content of the first phase would include such topics as development of company networks for managing support systems, analysis of interacting forces within a company, and ways to evaluate results and guide management decision and action which will maximize benefits. The second phase would carry these topics further in terms of specific application to individual situations. The content should not be devoted solely to entry level job programs. Identification of behaviors and consequences arising out of organizational processes would be a primary focus. Primary attention must be paid to at least three unique aspects:

> New communication groupings and patterns with requirements for their support and management;
>
> Fluctuating shifts of power going beyond established status and role positions;
>
> Techniques for making conflict productive including clarification of dynamics of consensus, conflict of interests, and advocacy-adversary processes.

The third and fourth phases - planning and implementation - should include at least five components. First, the supervisory program should focus on developing skills in understanding and management of people, the changing relationship of supervisors to managers, ways in which supervisory performance is judged, ways to provide support for supervisors' increased duties, and skills in working with informal management systems. The second important component is company information systems and procedures. The focus is on developing information systems and procedures which will accomplish two things. First, they will provide information on achievement of human manpower goals in a way that enables and encourages their achievement. Second, they will provide information about current decisions and action which enables the supervisor to identify his changing role and responsibilities.

A third component of content is ways to provide for increasing the spread of activities originated for minority and disadvantaged personnel so that all employees are able to participate and benefit. An essential fourth component is a special program conducted by blacks for other blacks. Encouraging blacks to evolve strategies by supporting increased communication among them will, in the long run, be a stabilizing force. The fifth component is funding and administrative procedures which can be used to support special interest groups within the organization such as groups of minority personnel.

2.4 Timing

Phase Two would probably be most effective after a lapse of time during which participants could test and integrate their learnings from the first phase. From the second phase, companies could move directly to the third and fourth phases which overlap and to some extent operate in parallel with each other. The fifth phase, use of consultants on specific situations, would supplement the third and fourth phases as required. It is important to realize that this workshop program is a long-term growth program or framework rather than a static, fixed, or short run affair.

2.5 Resources

Both human and material resources are required. In addition to funding and physical accomodations various program materials are required such as guides, simulation exercises, manuals, etc.

The human resources needed are mainly trainer-consultants experienced in organizational diagnosis, facilitating organizational change, and in designing and conducting experiential learning. These resources are available although some reorientation may be required to deal with the unique problems of minorities and the disadvantaged. Sharing resources among companies is desirable, and development of consultant-trainer skills within companies is an objective of the workshops. Different types of consultants, including behavioral scientists, would be used during different phases. Selection of the consultants would depend upon emphases appropriate to activities during a particular phase.

PART II: THE STUDY

FRAMEWORK OF STUDY

1.0 Introduction

In this section we shall present our purposes, and methods of study and some brief definitions. This is followed by a discussion of the contexts for this study, the ideas which gave us a frame of reference. This includes our ideas on the ways complex organizations are beginning to move and issues of change in organizational processes which arise from this movement. These include the issues of "racism" and "institutional racism". These broad movements and issues provide a context or envelope within which the problems and issues of hiring and retaining disadvantaged persons are viewed.

1.1 Purposes and Goals

The general purpose and goal of this study was to examine the impact upon the organization of activities to hire disadvantaged persons. Specific purposes and objectives were delineated at the beginning of the study. These purposes were adjusted and modified as we went along in the pilot stage of intensive dialogue with persons familiar both with the organizations and companies studied and the dynamics of programs and activities to hire and retain blacks. Throughout

1.1

Purposes and Goals

these discussions, we kept some key objectives in mind. The goals were to find information relevant to the following questions:

1. How are such activities initiated and what are the roles of the chief executive as well as upper, middle and lower levels of management? What seemed to be the strategy employed in establishing and introducing programs into the company? What were the effects on the organization of these modes of acting?

2. How do the management processes and activities act, react and cope with the processes and problems unleashed? What seem to be the determinants of behavior and tactics used in dealing with issues? What personal views of individuals toward social change are relevant?

3. What changes in organization behavior were experienced by members of the company? How did they see these alterations in company processes? As getting better? As getting worse?

4. What organizational management practices were effective in managing these processes? What invented practices seem to have relevance for other companies? What traditional practices can be used?

These objectives presuppose some sort of program, and some sort of success in managing the programs.

It is useful and necessary to state some things not sought after. We did not look for numerical indices of successful retention, nor the usual indices of succssful training of black and disadvantaged employees. We did not study characteristics of the new employees and their adjustments. We did not assess situations of out-and-out failures of programs. We wanted to study organizational behavior and organizational change.

1.2

Methods and Procedures

We met regularly in planning and analysis sessions before launching systematic data collection. Key individuals from the three companies to be studied (later reduced to two) met with the project staff to help in analysis and in design. The participants in the sessions were familiar with the companies, had worked in complex organizations, and had a familiarity and experience with the programs. In this way, mutual involvement and comprehension were developed for the project staff and for representatives of the companies. The

1.2

Methods and Procedures

project staff built an open arrangement so that the companies were not "just guinea pigs." Modifications were made as more valid data were obtained. No alterations were made on the basis of political or organizational sensitivity.

The interviews were conducted by persons who had a familiarity and experience in hiring and retaining persons, had lived "inside an organization", and were familiar with our design and purposes. Half the interviewers were black, two were black females. The project staff conducted interviews as well as coordinating the training and de-briefing of interviewers. The criteria for selection of people to interview was set by the project staff; the local liaison person in each division and unit made the appointments and found the interview setting.

1.3

Definition of Disadvantaged and Programs

In order to agree on the sort of activities and programs to be considered, we faced the issue of defining the disadvantaged in this study. Very briefly, we allowed and accepted the definition of meaning given by the company we were studying. Overall, it meant black employees primarily, with some Spanish speaking groups included. The narrower definition of disadvantaged would be limited to administrative definitions given by agencies and program groups. These definitions usually meant that the target group of new employees would be restricted to individuals of a limited socio-economic level, or a limited past history, or a record of anti-social behavior, prison record, delinquency, alcoholism, etc.

There were differences between the companies studied in the form of their programs for disadvantaged and minorities. This raised the question of criteria for defining the program. In looking at the activities of these companies, we saw four common critieria which defined their activities as programs despite differences in form. First, there was deliberate movement toward a goal which was expressed by words and other behavior. The goal was expressed also by new structures and systems to facilitate accomplishment of the goal. Second, there were new expectations of opportunities and responsibilities created within the organization and by the persons entering the organization. Third, there was extraordinary activity. There was significantly increased intensity and expansion of regular activities which were used to facilitate entry and integration of these new employees. There was also addition of new activities to meet specific needs of minorities and disadvantaged. Fourth, there was officially recognized responsibility for accomplishment of program goals either assigned to a formally separate program or assigned as a responsibility and accountability of line managers and recognized as part of their regular responsibilities.

1.4 Viewpoints of Study

How should a study of the impact of hiring the disadvantaged go about formulating the questions to ask? What overall viewpoints are the useful ones to use in deriving a frame of reference for these questions? And what are the practical managerial and organizational utilities of the questions, the contexts, and the frame of reference?

In this section we shall present our thinking related to these questions. We shall describe in broad scope some of the ideas that came to us as we proceeded to formulate and conduct the study. The notions we started off with were tested and modified both formally and informally with the advisory committee of the participating companies and with other observers and organizational analysts both in management, in management training, and, more directly, with specialists in organizational change and development.

The first overall viewpoint distills our observations of managements' concerns and reasons in undertaking a set of activities and programs in hiring disadvantaged. (3.4.1). The second expresses our judgements of long range organizational trends in contemporary society. (3.4.2). The third major frame of reference and perspective arises from realization of the poignant necessity for confronting change. The necessity becomes ever more urgent to create, use, and evaluate processes and technologies of planned change in organizing and conducting the internal affairs of organizations as they work with new situations and respond to changes in their environment. (3.4.3).

1.4.1 Reasons to Undertake Programs

As companies elect to venture into activities and programs for hiring the disadvantaged, for undertaking their training and retention, there are a set of statements often given as "reasons", and some not often given but which operate in fact.

1.4.1.1 Business Reasons

The most frequently offered reason is that hiring the disadvantaged and minorities is good for business overall. In so far as the country's economy is strong, so will each company prosper. Thus, a company enlarges its economic market directly and indirectly by making more income available to individuals who have not participated in the mainstream of the economy. This philosophy is not unique and restricted to programs of hiring, training and retaining the disadvantaged. It is a broad and far-sighted statement of self interest; a company is seen as one determinant within a large and complicated variety of forces operating in the general economy.

1.4.1.1

Business Reasons

Such philosophical moods do not translate into effective concern and commitment in and of themselves. Other concerns and motivations must be present also before the company takes a policy position.

1.4.1.2

Manpower Reasons

The second most often expressed concern is that there is a shortage of manpower, especially for certain entry level jobs. The company needs to develop a reservoir of manpower for these jobs. Companies justify their participation in hiring and training programs by their needs for scarce workers. Companies find it convenient to undertake a set of activities with goals sometimes couched in terms of social values, and sometimes couched purely in terms of self interest. They have images of large pools of skilled and/or trainable individuals who have been held back or are not readily available because of "discrimination." Either discrimination against individuals who are black or because the individuals have a social record which makes them either ineligible or not available through usual employment practices.

1.4.1.3

Crisis Reasons

The third concern is a reaction to immediate crisis and turmoil. Sheer physical survival of the plant, its capital investment, and its facilities necessitates some set of responses to defuze the dynamite. Riots and civil disorders trigger this fear.

As these survival concerns come to the surface, they are accompanied by a sense of responsibility to the ideology of free enterprise and the capitalist system. It is contended that people need a stake in the economy if they are not to blow up the system. Therefore, companies have a stake in preserving the system by making jobs available and getting stakeless individuals into jobs by whatever means are available. There is a sense of moral responsibility not just to the individual but also to the economic system as a whole as well as to the local community in which the company is located. Related to this sense of responsibility is the relief of guilt for social degradation of blacks and other disadvantaged. There are justifications for "holding together the social fabric," for patching over the seemingly widening gulf between the haves and the have nots in society.

1.4.1.4

Know-how Reasons

Fourth, and not to be minimized, is the pride in "American business know-how", in ability to tackle a problem and find workable solutions. American industry has demonstrated competence, using scientific and practical knowledge, in solving problems beyond the dreamed-of capacity of any social organizations ever invented by man.

1.4.1.4

Know-how Reasons

Therefore, there is a strong feeling that if and when industry applies its individual and collective minds and muscle to any problem, solutions will be found. A form of chutzpah energizes and motivates companies to undertake a task at which other segments of society have failed. Underlying this feeling is the optimism that "problems" can be solved given money, energy, and known management technology. It might be recalled that major industries were simultaneously undertaking projects under contract to provide management services to youth corps, housing, training programs, educational innovations, and so forth. More directly, industry, with varying degrees of conviction, always felt it knew how to train workers. This self confidence plays a part in its willingness to undertake training programs for those not usually deemed employable.

1.4.1.5

Government Role

A pivotal factor is the role of the federal government in not only demanding compliance with civil rights regulations by those who do business with the government, but in also offering guidelines and money for programs for hard core unemployed. The ability to undertake programs with financial sinews provided by the government gave an immediate justification for undertaking such activities and programs. This was reinforced by the fact that these government supports came with the close cooperation, indeed under sponsorship, guidelines, and controls, of business itself. This support for building parts of the total flow of manpower systems, i.e. pre-selection, counseling, referrals, and minimum basic skill training, etc., made the task more feasible.

1.4.1.6

Company Image

Another concern of management is with the nebulous factor called "image." Image seems to depend not only on how external groups view the company, but also includes how employees see the company. In preliminary investigations, the company's image in undertaking these programs was a matter of pride and an anchor of "this is a good company". Executives find that the company's image as an organization which takes larger social issues into consideration is useful in recruiting professional and management talent. Young people are increasingly inquiring how much and how sincerely the company engages in work on social problems.

1.4.2

Organizational Trends

Studies of organizational behavior and organizational response to growth and change have noted several trends. These trends have played a significant part in how companies have decided to undertake activities and programs, and in how they have responded when programs are underway.

1.4.2.1 Human and Profits

The first noticeable trend is for companies to become organizations with multiple goals. Both the mythology and reality of the economic profit motive as the sole basis of company action have given way to acknowledging more complex sets of goals and alternating priorities of goals. The sacred trust to stockholders, the capital invested expressed as profit, have been blended with other goals. These are sometimes held as values in and of themselves, but are more frequently seen as instruments in the pursuit of profits.

One such priority statement by a major company, as an example is as follows:

> "The company aims to be a successful business which lives out its concern for the dignity and worth of its members as it pursues profits. To accomplish this, the company will attempt to operate in such a way as to:
> accept people as they are;
> expect responsible behavior;
> support individual and personal growth;
> assist individuals to develop their competencies;
> enlarge the opportunity for impact of each individual in the company in every practical way;
> bend every effort to resolve conflicts through discussions and fair judgement, minimizing arbitrary rules and use of authority."

Dignity and worth of the members of the organization is, according to this statement, placed practically on a par with pursuit of profits. In spelling out what the general statement means, there are specific statements describing preferred approaches to people in the company. These statements reflect increased concern with a new view of man in organizations. He is no longer a mechanical cog in a bureaucratic, rule-ridden organization. Instead, he is autonomous and self actualizing. He has more responsibility, and his fulfillment of personal values within the company is acknowledged and supported. After all, managers could not very graciously restrict these values and conceptions of man to themselves and manipulate others solely to obtain more profits.

1.4.2.2 Concept of Profit

The broader framework of organizational analysis is the very concept of profits. Any organization exists to make profits - to take in materials, use resources, turn out products, and make a profit (gain) for itself. Profit is seen as money, satisfactions, stronger power position in its environment, growth of persons, or any increased gain of value to the organization as defined by its "goals". In this sense, churches exist to make a profit. Social

1.4.2.2

Concept of Profit

service and educational organizations are also profit making organizations. The accounting procedures for profit and the criterion of profit may differ; but profit analysis is applicable in evaluating the working processes of the organization.

There is growing awareness of the broad concept of profit in terms of growth of persons. "Our business is developing people." At the same time, success of a program tends to be measured in terms of how many of the personnel trained have been retained by the company. Personnel who are trained and then get jobs with other companies are often seen as a loss for the program even though, within the broad view, they are another criterion of success.

Organizations, either the company as a whole or parts of the total company, when suffused by these multiple goals, (especially when these goals express a conviction about increasing the human and humane qualities of the ways of working), must perforce enmesh with the issues of hiring, retaining, and maximizing the potential of the disadvantaged. In the companies studied, such pockets of conviction existed based upon some of the multiple goals described above.

1.4.2.3

Value of Man

Second, the company has put some human values up front. In the statement quoted above the company has made explicit a view of man as an individual bounded only by his search for meaning (albeit largely intended we suspect for people in management). Such a view of man in organizations is an inclusive not a restrictive or exclusionary statement. These value assumptions, obviously, must in some way come to have meaning as applied to the disadvantaged and the people who wish to be "accepted as they are".

Some members of the organization very quickly see the application of these value systems to disadvantaged persons outside the company. There develops an interest, a groundswell for the company to "do something meaningful", and for each individual to "do something personally."

Such thrusts to do something become part of the value system for individuals in a company, and in turn become ways of looking at and assessing whether the company "really means" their statements about human dignity and worth. The member of management is ready to test operational forms expressing these values: "Accepting people as they are, expecting responsible behavior, supporting individuals and personal growth, assisting individuals to develop their competencies, enlarging the opportunity for impact of each individual in the company in every practical way, resolving conflicts through open discussions and fair judgements, minimizing arbitrary rules and use of authority."

1.4.2.3

Value of Man

We suggest a simplistic extrapolation of individual motivation and concern from organizationally stated values. By this simplistic framework individual members test and relate to these organizational values.

In one of the participating companies, we found support for hiring programs based on these sorts of values. In another company, we found increased cynicism in regard to these values because of the way in which the programs for disadvantaged were conducted and mismanaged in their eyes. Explanations which saw the organizational and individual behavior as "racial prejudice" or "racial guilt" oversimplify the complex reality, and ignore the effect of organizational values.

1.4.3

Organizational Change

In undertaking these programs and activities, companies are deliberately engaging in planned change. Working effectively on "manpower" supply in the area of the disadvantaged and the social-political context of race and minorities requires that some people in the company recognize the potentially far reaching implications and effects on company norms, values and behaviors.

Vision or premonition helps in this complexly changing world. Far-sighted executives intuitively grasp that things can't and won't remain the same, but that turbulent social environments will impinge on the company. Companies will have to learn to cope with and manage these inputs. These inputs of the social world can be dampened out by the company's internal values, norms, and ways of working so that little change will occur. While recognizing the real probability of the latter, individuals in companies are beginning to look for ways to manage these processes as productively as possible. And, in some sectors, there is growing recognition that *in helping the organizational system to change, by engaging in problem solving processes on specific issues, the organization can also learn how-to-learn in order to cope with ever changing circumstances and "crises"* from the turbulent environment. In short, some of the properties of a learningful and problem solving organization, are essential for an organization's future effectiveness. And, even more visionary, is the concept of a self-renewal function of the organization - generating and working on before the fact the problems it must tackle for growth, and survival.

By tackling the problems of hiring and retaining minorities and disadvantaged, changing the organization's values, norms and ways or working, and in working to fulfill a company's self-proclaimed ideals of how it deals with people, there is opportunity to change a company in significant ways. Theorists

1.4.3 Organizational Change

and strategists can well point out this area as the most challenging opportunity at stake in undertaking activities and programs for the disadvantaged. It is impossible for us to conceive of these program activities as not involving some stirring up of core values of the company, much as some would try to minimize these implications.

1.4.4 Racism and Institutional Racism

Racism and institutional racism, while both are rooted in some form of individual prejudice and group discriminatory behavior, must be seen as phenomena with separate dimensions. An oversimplified statement of the additional unique features of racism and institutional racism would be as follows: "Institutional racism over and beyond prejudice and discrimination refers to those activities and norms, rules and procedures which are ostensibly created or evolved as supporting means for institutional goals but have the consequences, implied or unforeseen, of serving as barriers to achievement and attainment by racial minorities." Admittedly, the concept and term has a rhetorical connotation to serve the goal of advancing racial minorities. The proponents of the concept have assumed what sociologists call a "functionalistic" view, that is, behavior serves manifest and latent functions of purposes aside from the intentions of the act or actor.

The more blatant examples of racism would be: direct discriminatory barriers; attitudes towards racial groups, such as stereotypes and misconceptions about individuals of racial groups (whether favorable or unfavorable stereotypes); job entrance credentials; selection criteria; the timing and assumed time periods before upward mobility occurs; seniority rules; and the built-in assumptions of an institution as to desired personality types. All these while they may have a positive value, are patterns that would fit into subtle yet real forms of institutional racism.

Industrial organizations as well as other institutions are subjected to charges of institutional racism to the bewilderment of many in the organization. For example, attacks against entrance credentials for a job, (such as the high school diploma for a security guard job, or a college degree for a supervisor's job) are seen as threats to the values expressed in the ostensible reason for these requirements, as well as threats to the institutional structures built around these requirements.

There are, then, these complex institutional racisms, attitudes and values, which influence the ways in which an organization acts. In order to assess this factor, we focused on individual views about social actions and programs they considered legitimate and necessary to undertake in industrial

1.4.4 Racism and Institutional Racism

organizations. It is in this context, the social action considered appropriate for industry to undertake, that we constructed the Activity Scale. This stated action alternatives which individuals could consider appropriate response to the issues and problems of the disadvantaged. Each item of the Activity Scale was worded to indicate a positive value. These items are described in Appendix 2.

CASE HISTORY: SERVICE COMPANY

2.0 Company Reports Framework

Reporting information obtained for each company conveys a more complete picture and fuller flavor than trying to treat topics relevant to more than one company in such a general manner that the context and setting of a particular company is lost. Selection of the companies depended upon a number of criteria described above. (see Preface). The amount of data collected from the companies varied, depending upon their size and accessibility.

We are trying to report these data in a way that seems most likely to allow the reader to catch some of the on-going dynamics in the companies. Data from the interviews and observations that did not seem likely to accomplish this purpose were not included.

The purpose of this study was to investigate changes in organizational activities and processes that occurred as a result of carrying out activities and programs required to hire and retain the disadvantaged, especially black employees. As previously stated, we were concerned with investigation and inquiry, and we do not claim that these findings are substantiated in a rigorous fashion.

In the service company, three autonomous units were investigated. These units of the service company were complete, relatively self-sufficient organizations performing similar functions, but geographically separated. Five divisions were studied in the manufacturing company. These divisions were located in the same geographical area and were interdependent. They were differentiated by performing specialized functions. The transportation company is reported on briefly; they withdrew before the formal interviews and questionnaires were administered.

2.1 Service Company

Company X, the service company, as compared with the manufacturing company, is highly structured and traditional. The service company does, however, share the characteristics of having a highly charismatic leader and owner - a person who employees believe has large vision and leadership ability.

2.1 Service Company

The service company has a small central corporate staff and relatively autonomous operating units in major cities around this country and in several foreign countries. A number of these units have developed world wide renown for outstanding service to prestigious clients.

2.1.1 Company Characteristics

An important characteristic of the service company is that it has a great many low skill jobs and consequently has a long history of employing unskilled, inexperienced, and unschooled people. Long before NAB-JOBS, the company employed blacks, Puerto Ricans, semi-literate people and recent immigrants. So they have had experience with people who are now labeled minorities and disadvantaged, but they have developed also an elaborate, carefully stratified organizational society which to the employees seemed natural and from an outsider's view would seem "segregated". The fact that the industry is heavily influenced by European traditions has reinforced this pattern of ethnic separation.

But minority group members are, and have been for years, employed - in particular job categories, and for minority employees with limitations on opportunity for movement within a unit or in the company, limitations which were built in by the social system. Apart from the top levels of management, only specially trained technical people could move from unit to unit within the company. This is understandable since the units are in separate cities, and the cost of moving families would be considerable.

The person who was president of the service company at the time of our study was a member of the family which founded this corporation and, with several of his brothers, owned and managed the company. The president had been personally involved in a number of activities aimed at educational and social change including close association with the human relations programs of a local university. He was perceived as a social activist so his vigorous leadership in bringing the company into partnership with the NAB-JOBS program was seen as consistent behavior.

It is also worth noting that a number of senior managers in the service company had participated in sensitivity training groups within the company as well as public programs sponsored by NTL Institute and related institutions. In addition there were internal and external organizational consultants "helping" higher management groups develop improved planning, problem solving, and decision making skills. All these activities had been promoted and supported by the president and contributed, both positively and negatively, to subsequent results of the NAB-JOBS program:

2.1.1 Company Characteristics

positively by preparing a number of senior managers for the challenges presented by the need to change company norms of behavior and company structure,

negatively since all "programs" have been viewed as transitory interests of the president which people think will not be followed through.

The service company was also in a continuous "close" financial condition. Several new market efforts had required great amounts of capital investment without satisfactory results, and the company had been trimming costs for several years prior to the current general business decline. The NAB-JOBS program was seriously affected by this financial climate.

2.1.2 Development of Programs

When the president introduced the program several years ago, some managers welcomed it on moral grounds and were happy to see their company moving in such a direction. Others supported the program as a means of relieving the tight labor market with the help of government training funds. Some resisted it as another temporary flight of the president's fancy which would "come in with trumpets and flourishes and steal away quietly in the night", while still others quietly worked to preserve the segregated status quo.

The president invited key managers of the company from the corporate group with division vice presidents and general managers of the larger operating units to live together in a big city ghetto house during an intensive confrontation training session with a group of black trainers. One vice president characterized that experience as "violent, but useful and appropriate". Another said, "It was a conversion experience for me". A third senior manager said, "It had a profound effect - not that it changed my attitudes, but it changed my priorities and my time table".

From their reactions during interviews and from secondary data sources, we found that the first stage training for top managers described above was generally successful. However, there was still the perceived difference between "our program" and "the president's program".

The top executive also appointed a special assistant as Program Manager for all activities related to employing minority and disadvantaged persons and community relations. There is some evidence that this shifted the responsibility for results to the Program Manager. At least there were visible no mechanisms or procedures which placed accountability upon unit managers through reporting and evaluation procedures

2.1.2 Development of Programs

such as the computer tallies on numbers of minorities which were used in the manufacturing company. At the time of our survey and throughout the subsequent year we were still left with the feeling that it was primarily a program of interest to the president - monitored only by his office. Even that monitoring decreased in intensity until, with layoffs and the reassignment of the presidential assistant, the program -as a visible, ongoing effort - did seem to "steal away quietly in the night". However, elements of concern and activities initiated by the program continue to work within the organization.

2.1.3 Reactions to Programs

The type of intensive confrontation training which seemed successful with higher management people did not work well with lower and middle management people. Why is not clear. Evidence from other organizations suggests that top management people, with their larger view of the organization, a longer view of the future, and somewhat removed from direct contact or competitiveness with minority and disadvantaged people are generally more liberal in their views. In any case, in the service company almost everyone except the very top management people testified that intensive emotional confrontation sessions were a "disaster".

What was perceived as effective, however, was a supervisory skills training program conducted by head office people in Unit B. We heard many testimonials from supervisors who participated in that program as well as from their subordinates and from their superiors. The supervisory training program had nothing specifically to do with black-white relations or the disadvantaged. The program placed heavy emphasis on supervisory behavior with subordinates. It is difficult to predict what results might accrue from a similar program in other units since Unit B also had by far the most vigorous top management and staff support. In our opinion the supervisory training program influenced greatly the process of changing styles of management and norms for work rules.

In review, then, some of the factors which seemed to UNFREEZE the situation in the service company were:

a. the direct intervention of the president;

b. the black-white encounter training for top management;

c. sensitivity training and organizational change programs with top management and some other higher management people; and

d. a good supervisory skills program for first line supervisors and middle management.

2.1.4

Restraints

The black-white encounter training with lower and middle management definitely had a negative effect. Several other factors acted as restraints on the program. One of these was the European heritage of the industry plus the significant number of European managers. The European tradition is founded on a service model of subservience and strict caste and ethnic control of jobs. This attitude was reinforced in Unit B by the equally constraining traditions of the American South. Another restraining factor in Unit A was the extraordinarily powerful city-wide industry control by unions. Whether the union was as much a constraint as the company perceived it was debated by a number of people in Unit A, in other units, and in the central office. It was suggested that Unit A found it useful not to confront that situation. We were not able to evaluate this since we were discouraged from any involvement with the union or the non-exempt (hourly) members of the staff of Unit A. In Units B and C we obtained as much or more interview and survey data from hourly as we did from salaried personnel. Whatever the "fact", several key management people in Unit A were convinced that the union would never agree to have hourly people interviewed for the study. They were also convinced, for the same reason, that Unit A would never be able to use any of the funds available from contractually obligated training for the purpose of training first line supervisors. In short, it was their conviction that the union had resisted many efforts and programs suggested by the management, including the NAB-JOBS program.

It was never suggested that such resistance was overt. The union was said to "publicly support, but not only never helped, but obstructed in whatever ways it could". Our only direct data came from interviews. One was a supervisor who told how he and the shop steward held a joint meeting with the employees to obtain their support. The other was a union steward who talked with great pride about his personal efforts to help several of the new trainees to break into his own department, and how he influenced his co-workers. He was very proud of the success of several trainees in his group and saddened by the drug crisis which caused the discharge of another.

2.1.5

Program Results

The indications, therefore, were that training of upper management people helped significantly to create new awareness of human situations and consequently support for this program. As you would imagine, those effects spilled over into many other dimensions of the management process. The extreme form of black-white encounter training was ineffective in the lower, more directly competitive levels of supervision. In all units the unfreezing of norms and attitudes was restrained

2.1.5

Program Results

by the ethnically discriminatory practices of the industry and/or the geographic area.

Other studies have documented the impact on individual trainees which resulted from NAB-JOBS. We will not dwell on those effects in this report. Suffice it to say that we heard many testimonials which suggested that trainees grew, learned, and, when layoffs caught them or they found other opportunities, they moved into jobs for which they would never before have considered themselves candidates. Some failed, quit, or were fired for inability to do the job or inability to change their behavior (stealing, fighting, or just plain, blatant prejudice). We heard one painful story of the healthy, young black man "who just couldn't move fast enough for this job". It would have been funny had it not been such a tragic example of racism. And, finally, some individuals grew and are still functioning as employees of the company.

During the process of learning how to operate the NAB-JOBS program several exciting new services were initiated in each of the three units. Training, education and counseling came into being during this period and seemed to be well established permanent functions at the time of our survey a year or more later. One of the corporate officers said, "We never knew how to train people before." It might be useful to take a brief look at the changes which occurred in each unit since there were some significant differences.

Unit A seemed to have had the most prior experience with employment of unskilled people at several organizational levels. We felt the environment of European ethnicity was extreme in this unit, but there was a long history of employment of black and Spanish-speaking people in low-grade low visibility jobs. There were no blacks in predominantly Italian or Greek departments, however, and all evidence seemed to indicate that there never had been. The NAB-JOBS program seemed to have been primarily the creature of the Personnel Manager of this unit, and this was the unit where the program seemed to have the least institutional results. Trainees had been introduced into "classes" irrespective of real job openings, and often sat around in the personnel office because no one else seemed able to deal with them. This caused considerable resentment, and also resulted in the labeling of a "NAB trainee" as being unfit for regular employment. The Personnel Manager saw himself, and was seen by others, as the person who "put a trainee into a job" or removed the trainee if things didn't go well. In general, managers did not appear to have felt responsible, or even particularly aware of the special efforts. One key executive, however, felt Personnel put too much attention on this program. He said, "Tremendous effort went into NAB, but the Personnel Manager was too diverted. Personnel shifted its attention to the exclusion of other functions".

2.1.5

Program Results

In Unit A we've mentioned above the attitudes about the union. Top management people here viewed the union as a significant barrier while others, lower in management, saw the union as having "cooperated well". In this unit educational programs were expanded and new ones initiated with very positive response at all levels. A black woman was hired as a job counsellor and became very effective in helping all kinds of people: trainees and long-term employees, black and white, male and female. People at all levels were extremely proud of her and her accomplishments.

Overall the organizational results of the NAB-JOBS program in Unit A seem to have been mixed. There was uniform agreement that education, training and counseling were useful additions to the organization. Attitudes seem to have modified:

> "It opened the eyes of people about blacks."
>
> "Supervisors' eyes were opened. They are better able to deal with problems now."
>
> "People are better able to handle tough cases."
>
> "We realized we should take more interest in people."
>
> "I'm more tolerant of the problems people have."
>
> "We tend to overlook dress, long hair, etc., now."
>
> "We learned a lot about what was needed for others."
>
> "We don't see race as a problem."

In spite of such attitudinal change and the new educational training and counseling the organization appeared to be essentially unchanged. There were no blacks in responsible management positions, nor were there very many in publicly visible jobs. The chief executive of this unit said, "I don't understand why we didn't develop more black management." Other comments were:

> "There wasn't much change in systems or procedures because of NAB."
>
> "I don't see system changes except in education."
>
> "Hiring practices haven't changed."

Unfortunately, there was a rather general feeling among middle management and professional people which was expressed this way by one person, "I'm not convinced that top management

2.1.5

Program Results

was behind the program; they talked a good game, but we had to do the job. There is a negative ending to a positive program. NAB increased the mistrust of top management. They didn't follow through."

Unit B was quite different. Not only did there seem to be greatly increased education, training, and counseling activity, plus changed attitudes, but the organization seemed to have developed new norms and procedures with respect to people in general and minorities in particular. Here are a few quotes from black people in Unit B:

> "This place has come a long way." (professional staff)
>
> "Blacks get hired and move as easy as the white man." (Hourly worker)
>
> "NAB gave me a new life, and X made it happen." (unskilled woman who moved into a secretarial career with help from a top level manager)
>
> "We have support from top management here. They listen and respond." (professional staff)

The last comment seemed to our interviewers to characterize the difference. In Unit B the local top management was constantly and visibly perceived as pushing for change. The position of one of those managers was stated this way, "It takes a few people with influence and power to get things started." In addition to the visibility of the top managers, the program manager was the black Personnel Manager. It would be difficult to overstate his influence. Like the black woman who is the job counsellor in Unit A, this man was applauded by blacks and whites at all levels of the organization. Not only did he marshal support for the program and the trainees, but he opened up the promotion system for all people. He was uniformly seen as a person who "helped", and in an enormous variety of ways. With his own vigorous activity and the support of his superiors he pushed for changes in norms and procedures such as: Black people now enter the building through the front door; locker room and cafeteria rules are changed; dress and hair styles are different; blacks are visible in the public as well as the non-public parts of the organization; blacks occupy a number of important management positions; hiring and promotion norms are changed; people feel treated as whole persons, etc., etc. We do not suggest that he did all this alone, we simply report that in interview after interview his name was connected directly to the changes, to success, and to the sense of having been "helped". So, the combination of visible management support and a black program manager seemed to have produced significant permanent change.

This was not accomplished without resistance and some failures. As in other units the special interracial encounter sessions produced unhappy reactions. A black manager said, "It was of no value to me. It was a general insult to my intelligence. You couldn't defend yourself. It was very

2.1.5

Program Results

one-way. I was disillusioned. I learned no more about black or white people." A black professional said, "It was a lot of lip service. Those supervisors went right back to their jobs after the intensive program, but they took nothing good back to their jobs. It was a waste of time and money." As you would guess, some people hung on to their attitudes and stated that, "It was all unfair in favor of blacks."

One management procedure succeeded in placing a number of black people in higher positions, but may have been counter-productive for many people. This was the practice of almost instant termination for a number of fairly senior and long service managers who could not change fast enough. An hourly worker said, "Several key management people were let go because they didn't go along." A white professional said, "There was lots of reorganization to get blacks into top jobs. On balance, I think it was a good idea." For many others, however, the "blood bath" in Unit B and another unit in the same city, created a general environment of insecurity plus a substantial amount of indignation. "If you can't manage a good idea without resorting to such terrible practices, I wonder what you really believe in!" The corporate officer responsible agreed later that the method was unfortunately harsh and the communication poor, even though the result was a rapid increase in the number and quality of black managers.

Although the economic future of Unit B was in question for reasons unrelated to the program, we had the clear impression that a lot of change had occurred. We also felt that many of the norms and procedures would become institutionalized if the unit continued to operate under that company's management. The number of black managers alone would be sufficient to carry forward what had been changed. One possible restraint on "institutionalization" is the general attitude among blacks that, "There is a limit to how high you can go." This meshed with a general feeling among all except top management people in all units that the company lacked any clear concept of career growth. A great many of the people we interviewed (in all units) who were applauding the educational and training progress told us that they personally would probably leave "when I get my degree", or "when I finish my training" because they didn't believe they could really move to the top in this company.

Unit C is far smaller than the other two. We had an opportunity to talk with people at all levels and in all job categories, but the number was still small. This unit is so situated that poor people from the inner city have a transportation problem. In spite of that problem, Unit C looked like a smaller edition of Unit B. The management was seen as responsive and responsible. Many black people noted substantial change. Others thought it wasn't enough. Some whites thought it was awful, etc.,etc. Here are some comments:

> "There was no difference between NABS and regular off-street hires."

2.1.5

Program Results

"The service business is not good for blacks. They resent service jobs."

"Blacks feel intimidated, but the union helps to keep that in control."

"The program helped communications in my department."

"More people are promoted from within."

"The education program was strengthened and broadened, especially the English program".

"Career planning is missing. Growth is hard in a service industry - especially for blacks."

"It is easy to talk to the bosses here."

"You can get along if you want to. Anyone can get to be a supervisor." (this was a black woman who did!)

"NAB didn't really work. There was little interest from top corporate management. A great process, but no follow through."

Our experience with Unit C was not as discouraging as that last comment. We felt, overall, that the local management in Unit C did effect some change and that most of the change would be noticeable for some time to come. The rest of that comment seemed to agree with what we observed for the service company. The program did, indeed, seem to have lost the interest and support of the top management, and many people interviewed seemed to feel that was the way of all programs, i.e. "no follow through."

2.1.6

Impact and Changes

From our brief experience an overall estimate is that the service company was significantly and permanently changed so far as its attitudes toward people and toward use of education, training, and counseling to increase human capabilities and resources. We cannot point to any other positive organizational growth or change for which we could predict a long and useful life. We cannot judge the impact of the recession in that industry, but we can state that:

> belief in commitment of top corporate management to carry through implications of social action was reduced rather than increased;
>
> to be successful program support must be obtained not only by top management decree but by consistent top management behavior and institutionalized control and reward system;

2.1.6

Impact and Changes

the appointment of a Presidential Assistant as Program Manager may well offer the opportunity to drain off line manager responsibility and accountability for the program;

the fact that this special training was neither identifiably "vestibule" (i.e. special work - off the job), nor clearly on real jobs increased the spot light effect and increased resistance; and

the "great man" can get things started, but they will keep going and grow only if the commitment to them is widely shared.

2.1.7

Further Development

As was said above, our experience with the service company was brief. Additional information indicates that the dilemma of strategies after initial commitment by the top executive was recognized. Continued push by the chief executive can make it his program and block line management ownership. But lack of visible action by the top executive leads some to perceive lack of commitment and direct guidance. Conscious choice was made to limit direct action by the chief executive in order to encourage line managements' ownership of the program.

Since the study was conducted, the effect of attitudes and activities developed by the program have continued. In addition to the wider scope and increased skills in education, training, and counseling, there has been some increase in blacks in managerial positions as well as more blacks in publicly visible jobs. Dress, hair style, and arrest records are less of a barrier. Managers are more willing to take risks and try to screen people in rather than out.

CASE HISTORY: MANUFACTURING COMPANY

2.2

Manufacturing Company

Company Y is a manufacturing company with a product that is a household word nationally as well as in foreign countries. It has grown from a small research organization to a large industrial organization with many divisions and is one of the 500 leading corporations of the United States. The success of the company's product is largely due to its active research program in chemicals and paper.

As an organization the company places a high value on interpersonal relationships and individual freedom and creativity. These values are a heritage from the days when

2.2

Manufacturing Company

it was a small research organization. They are, however, currently vital and pervasive values. "We think of Y as a community of members, working together for the well being of our enterprise. We believe that our entire community must be supportive of the needs and desires of each individual member as he seeks to make full use of his capabilities." The effort to put these values into practice, in the context of a large, complex organization is an underlying characteristic which explains many of the ways in which the company is unique.

These values are also a major reason for the company's exceptional achievement in its programs for minority groups and disadvantaged persons. The achievement has been significant, and part of its significance lies in the comment from a manager: "That we have achieved so much only makes one realize how much is yet to be done."

The employee-oriented attitude of the company and the comparatively high level of employee benefits has given it the reputation of a good place to work.

2.2.1

Area of Study

Company Y has many divisions each specializing in some function of the operation or product. Thus, there is a division focused on manufacture of the product, another on customer services related to the product, a division concerned with construction and maintenance of facilities, another dealing with assembly of the product, and others concerned with engineering research, etc. Several of these divisions are located in the Boston metropolitan area; and this study was carried out in five of these divisions. Interviews were conducted in only four divisions. The corporate offices are also located in this area.

Following are brief descriptions of the four divisions included in this study in which interviews were conducted.

Division H is a small division (approximately 200 persons) located near a business district and low rent housing. There are comparatively good public transportation facilities. It is a customer service unit with semi-skilled and skilled occupations and sequential and interdependent operations tending to production line patterns.

Division M serves all other divisions in this area with respect to building construction and maintenance. A large percentage of its personnel are in the skilled trades or crafts. The work pattern includes individual assignment, assignment to work groups of others with the same skill, or assignment to task teams of mixed skills. Another differentiation of significance within the division is whether the work is performed outside (in the field) with the workers going to various locations as needed, or the work is performed in-house and the worker remains at one location.

2.2.1 Area of Study

Division S is predominantly composed of assembly operations. There are many entry level jobs as well as semi-skilled. The proportion of workers of minority group and disadvantaged backgrounds is comparatively high. In some areas of this division forty to sixty percent minority and disadvantaged personnel were cited and twenty-five percent seemed to be taken for granted. "Even blacks refer to it as the Ink Spot." This division is located within walking distance of a business district and low rent housing. It is also within reasonable commuting distance from the metropolitan ghetto area, but public transportation, while feasible, is not direct and convenient.

Division T is a manufacturing division. It is one of the larger divisions of the company in the Boston area and is located on the fringe of the metropolitan area near a predominantly middle and upper class residential area. Public transportation facilities from the ghetto and other communities in the metropolitan area are poor to non-existent.

2.2.2 Company Norms and Processes

The purpose of this section is to give some understanding of the company's norms, and the processes which build upon and carry out these norms. Understanding a company's norms is critical to an evaluation of its ability to develop and implement new programs. Later we will discuss in more detail the ways these company norms and processes were perceived as affecting programs for minorities and disadvantaged - the pluses and the minuses.

As stated above, company Y values individual freedom, creativity, and action. These values have led to norms encouraging informal groupings which cut across levels of the formal management hierarchy.

These groupings, although informal, can and do exert a good deal of influence upon planning, policies, and action of the company. Because the company encourages these informal groups to communicate and participate with formal management, participation in these groups represents many levels of the formal organization. This establishes a significant network for effective communication and influence. For example, near the end of this study the Black Group received official recognition, but till that time it had been operating actively and was very influential in its unofficial capacity for approximately the last five years.

There is no union, but the Grievance Committee, which is an official organization of the company, serves this function. Members of the Grievance Committee are elected representatives of their areas. As well as handling individual

2.2.2

Company Norms and Processes

grievances arising from work situations, the Grievance Committee is seen as the guardian of employees' seniority rights and procedures. Problems have been "grieved" all the way to the company president.

Another influential group, in addition to the Black Group and the Grievance Committee, is the University Group. This is an unofficial group formed originally from people who had shared some training experience at one of the local universities. The original membership has expanded and altered so that the University Group now includes persons of top management as well as most other levels. Although informal and unofficial, this group has exerted considerable influence upon specific programs and activities.

"Posting" is a significant process in this company for career advancement, at least at the levels of the hourly employee and lower management. All vacant positions, at these levels, are "posted" or advertised within all divisions of the company, and all employees, after an initial three month employment period, are eligible to apply. If this internal recruiting process fails to find anyone qualified, applicants are sought from outside the company.

The president, who founded the company, is given great credit for its success. There is a strong belief in his leadership abilities as well as his personal qualities of caring and concern for employees' welfare. One of the company objectives ascribed to his leadership is that "people are our second aim". By many the president is seen as a person of great vision whose intentions, to a greater or lesser degree, are perverted by the system.

The accessibility of the president to groups as well as individuals is significant. This accessibility is shown by his willingness to discuss general company issues and personal problems. Added to this general availability is his relationship to employees who have been with the company for many years. He knows many of them directly from the early years when the company was small. Although these older employees are now spread widely throughout the company, they are perceived as having more access to the president than others. This is both understood as "natural", and, to some extent, resented.

2.2.3

Development of Programs for Minorities and Disadvantaged

Significant and possibly critical factors for the results of an organizational program reside in the way the program was brought about - the motivation for the programs, the interplay of forces in the system, and the strategies used. This section will describe these factors as perceived by persons interviewed during the study.

2.2.3

Development of Programs for Minorities and Disadvantaged

It should be noted that this company carried on its activities and programs for minorities and disadvantaged with no government support.

An explicit event which most respondents picked up as the initiating factor was the president's speech to employees on a day set aside in memory of Martin Luther King. This was immediately after Reverend King's assassination. The president made a personal appeal to all employees to find ways to increase numbers of minority group personnel and disadvantaged within the company. The president's clear expression of deep feeling and commitment to this issue awakened the personal commitment of many employees. "It had a very deep effect on most of the people there. It cut through the prejudices. It was right."

The president's appeal, however, was perceived as lacking support of some senior employees who felt threatened, even though reassured that seniority procedures would not be affected. Some managers felt also that the direct appeal to employees was premature. Ways and means should have been worked out first with the managerial staff. "People don't plan. They just get emotionally excited, plow ahead, and then recoil when the results are in." Other comments included: "This lack of program planning is typical of this company. Deciding to do something without planning works well with mechanical programs but may miss the boat on social jobs."

This absence of official, specific, overall programs was perceived by some as lack of support by the president and his staff. They did not own the programs. One manager described the initiation and history of the program as follows: "The president in a meeting with the Minority Committee discussed the possibility of his making a speech to all employees. He gave us a preview. There was a lot of backlash from senior employees. Then, when he made the speech (on a day set aside in memory of Martin Luther King), there was more negative reaction. So there was no official company action. The thing just died. Top management wouldn't own it. A few individuals at the top had been pressing for more action for minorities and disadvantaged even before King's death. They continued and finally results began to show. In the last year and a half management is beginning to own the program."

From another point of view this was exactly the point. The strategy could be seen as letting the managers and employees themselves own and develop the programs. A comment which summarizes some of this reaction was: "The president's speech favored a careful approach. It precipitated the feeling

2.2.3

Development of Programs for Minorities and Disadvantaged

that the time was ripe for action. Most of us agreed, but a few felt it was for the birds." Thus, the president's action crystallized a climate and direction with senior managers responsible for designing their own programs.

With the rush to get results at the beginning of the programs, entry of relatively large numbers of minority and disadvantaged personnel was seen by many at different levels as chaotic. The implementation was "too much too fast. We created unneccessary problems such as a large number of blacks for whom there was no work." "We need more screening. Not just let down the gates and bring everybody in." "In the beginning the company sent buses into the ghetto and said 'Anyone who wants a job get in'." A more orderly approach used was described as, "When we had a requisition for four positions and five equally qualified persons were available, one of whom was black, we increased the requisition to get the black. Against this was the comment that, "We hired indiscriminately just to play the numbers game."

The impression is that the amount of activity to bring in minority and disadvantaged personnel by direct hire differed greatly among divisions and among areas within each division. The individual commitment of specific managers and supervisors was a large factor. In some cases this might lead to such techniques as quota pressure. Another factor affecting the amount and kind of direct hire activity were differences in the qualification level required. Those divisions with a large proportion of unskilled, entry level jobs were in the best position to take quick action. Divisions with a high proportion of skilled positions felt more restricted. It is important to realize, however, that rather than a specific, clearly structured program, the thrust to encourage entry of minorities and disadvantaged personnel was pervasive and took many forms depending upon the needs of individuals and groups involved.

The corporate personnel office with divisional personnel offices performed a thread function among and within divisions for the various activities that comprised the programs. Their functions included: enabling program activities to become aware of related activities so they could link with them when useful and appropriate, helping divisions assess their needs and stimulate new activities to meet these needs, participating in planning of program activities as well as surveillance of program accomplishments.

In effect, the program strategy put responsibility for bringing in minority groups and disadvantaged personnel on all levels of management without laying down hard and fast rules or specific procedures (other than Vestibule Training) to accomplish this, thus leaving freedom of initiative open. Top management performed both an enabling role to encourage

2.2.3

Development of Programs for Minorities and Disadvantaged

specific actions to reach the objective and a reminding or accountability role by publication to management personnel of regular reports on the number and level of minority persons in each department. A manager commented that, "I decided that the only way to be sure a significant number of blacks were hired was to see that goals - in numbers - were set and commitments obtained from line supervisors. I reviewed their goals every week. We reached our goal - forty percent."

Activities for minority and disadvantaged personnel have taken many forms. The objective of bringing into the company minority groups and disadvantaged persons was clear, but the ways this was to be accomplished were left to the initiative of management in the various divisions and other groupings within the company. There was pressure from many levels of management to accomplish this objective but the only specific, official, company-wide action was to abolish the high-school completion requirement for entry level jobs.

2.2.4

Programs for Minorities and Disadvantaged

As the comments above suggest, several methods have been used to encourage entry of minority and disadvantaged persons and retain them after entry. It seems to have been part of the company's policy to avoid setting up special programs for this purpose which would label the persons in the programs, thus separating them from other workers. The approach used was to adapt ongoing programs, such as training, to meet needs of minority and disadvantaged personnel as well as other employees. Therefore, instead of trying to present a clearly defined program, this section will try to identify some of the components that entered into the mix.

The part of the program that we are calling Vestibule Training has an interesting history. Originally it was planned as an independent corporation to be financed through a consortium of several companies in the area. It's policy, therefore, was to help minority and disadvantaged persons become employed. There was no restriction on where they found employment. Although the companies financing the operation would presumably be the most likely to provide employment, trainees were encouraged to find employment where they felt the opportunity was greatest.

At the time of this study the plans for support by a consortium of companies had not matured, and Vestibule Training was a wholly owned subsidiary of company Y

However, it was still the objective of Vestibule Training to help trainees find jobs wherever the trainee saw the greatest opportunity for him. The company was very active in placing trainees within its own organization but this was support rather than restriction.

2.2.4

Programs for Minorities and Disadvantaged

The primary purpose of Vestibule Training was not job or skill training but helping the trainee produce evidence for a prospective employer of the trainee's potential -- specifically helping the trainee build up a record of regular attendance at work which he could display. It was anticipated that, once entry to a company was gained, the trainee would receive on-the-job training to acquire necessary skills. Individual counseling was provided trainees during their stay in Vestibule Training as well as after they had gone to jobs in company Y or elsewhere. Vestibule Training was geographically separate from company Y except for a unit located in one of the divisions.

Another significant part of the programs was initiation and evolution of the Black Group. As the name indicates, this was a black caucus concerned with problems of black employees. It developed with encouragement of management but without explicit official sanction although employees were permitted to spend company time on its activities. At the time of this study the Black Group had been operating for approximately five years in this unofficial, informally sanctioned manner. Near the end of this study the Black Group was accorded official status as part of the corporate personnel office.

Three functions of the Black Group were identified by respondents during the study. One was as a clearinghouse of information on opportunities available for blacks as well as counseling and encouragement to take advantage of these opportunities. Another function was facilitation of communication between blacks and their supervisors and with other employees. Closely related to this was the Group's help to blacks in having their problems heard by management. This last was seen by many as a threat to established practices particularly to the Grievance Committee which was composed of whites.

Some perceived the Black Group as a tool of the personnel office. A supervisor said he had "settled" a discipline case involving a black, "But the personnel office sicked the Black Group representative onto me."

Aside from the specific components mentioned above, the programs consisted mainly of established, ongoing activities such as education and training and the summer program. None of these were specifically set up for persons of minority groups or disadvantaged but were open to all. However, courses in basic skills such as English, for example, and other subjects leading to a high school equivalency certificate were aimed at the needs of minorities and disadvantaged. There was also emphasis on getting minority personnel and

2.2.4

Programs for Minorities and Disadvantaged

disadvantaged into skill training courses which would upgrade their job proficiency.

There was often keen competition to get into training courses and there was continuous surveillance by the Black Group and others to see that as many minority personnel as possible were included. The amount of training carried on by the company was significantly increased as a direct response to the objective of bringing in more minority and disadvantaged personnel. So it was part - and a significant part - of the program although it was not restricted to minority or disadvantaged personnel.

In addition to the ongoing education and training programs, the "summer program" also offered opportunities to encourage employment of minority and disadvantaged youth. This program for employment of young people during the summer months was a well established part of the company's operations. So well established, in fact, that the "right" to have one's son or daughter work during the summer at the company seemed to be considered by some as a perquisite of their employment.

Therefore, there was a good deal of negative reaction when it was suggested that the summer program be restricted to youths of minority groups and disadvantaged. Although this restriction was not put into effect, the summer program was used effectively in many ways to provide entry for young people of minority groups and the disadvantaged.

2.2.5

Process of Change

It is well at this point to make explicit a framework that underlies our analysis of the data from this study. This framework for looking at the development of the programs and their effect is that suggested by Kurt Lewin. According to his concept, change is accomplished in three stages. The first stage can be called "unfreezing". During this stage old patterns are upset by introduction of new elements. The next stage is "change" where new ways of operating are experimented with in order to cope with new situations. The last stage is "refreezing" where the new ways of operating are more or less consciously adopted as regular patterns of behavior and become accepted practice or institutional norms.

Any assessment of where the programs and the company are within this framework must be a matter of judgement and take account of different levels and areas of change. In general, most of the divisions studied seem to have reached the second stage of experimentation with new ways of operating. However, some areas have not introduced any significant number of minority personnel or disadvantaged. "Significant" here means a number that would cause persons to become aware of and reexamine their fixed patterns of behavior.

2.2.5

Process of Change

At this point of time we perceived two attitudes which seemed to add up to the same result, namely decreased energy and steam about the programs which suggested the need for renewal strategies. People expressed satisfaction that we had done it, but now it was completed and we could go back to doing business as usual. "The initial impact is diminishing. People are more willing to say no. It's going back to the way it was before the programs started. We're saying 'Isn't that great!' when numerically there's only six to eight percent minority." From another viewpoint, employment of disadvantaged and minority persons was accepted as a continuing responsibility and challenge, which it was felt could be taken care of by working on individual situations using familiar labels such as "communication". "Our problems are organizational not cultural or racial", and "Communication is the problem but these situations are interpreted as black-white issues" are two of the comments. The main challenges, these respondents felt, were and are efficiency and production. Little if any change was perceived by them.

Minority committees under various names had been set up in different divisions when it was decided that the corporate minority committee was too unwieldy, but respondents felt these committees had lost whatever steam they had initially. As of now, these minority committees were viewed by respondents as dealing only with routine matters either because they would not or could not deal with significant matters. "It's a farce. It spends time on trivial things." This may reflect a feeling that the period of significant problems is over as well as the attitude that there are no new problems - just the old ones for which precedents and procedures are established. In one division it was management policy that the minority committee was only advisory and, more significantly, that there was no use its discussing situations about which the committee could do nothing, e.g. supervisor's actions. Nevertheless, the committee had brought information about problem situations out in the open, and this information has led to action.

The respondent who said, "Things are fine. We've done a good job and met our goals" was probably more complacent than most, although many respondents tended to look at the effort as accomplished. There were, however, statements such as "Hiring blacks is more complex than we realized, and requires more effort and imagination to make it work." There were also many statements which expressed strong commitment to the objective of bringing in persons of minority groups and disadvantaged while expressing much frustration with the problems of doing this, e.g. craft requirements for long apprenticeship commitment. Still, these conveyed the overall feeling that, while we may not be satisfied with what we have done, there are no new activities or programs in the works.

We can work on resolving the problems we have without mounting any new pushes.

2.2.5

Process of Change

To force the various levels of action and reaction within the company into the framework of unfreezing-change-refreezing may well be too neat. The situation might be summed up as follows: Unfreezing and change has occurred under the impact of entry by minorities and disadvantaged due to the original, emotionally charged thrust. From this has come greater awareness of the needs of the company and of the minority groups and the disadvantaged. There has been change in the ways people are brought into the company and progress (at least at lower levels) within the company: dropping the high school graduation requirement, Vestibule Training, and favoring appointment of blacks and disadvantaged (at least when qualifications of "potential" are reasonably equal). Introducing these new elements has brought change also in the power and influence relations within the company.

There is a great deal of experimenting with ways to incorporate these new elements into the company including their challenges to older attitudes, policies and procedures. A particularly urgent problem now is, "Where do they go from here?" Career advancement for minority groups and disadvantaged persons challenges the gradual, life time advancement practices accepted by tradition and buttressed by seniority policies.

A general assessment, then, is that unfreezing has occurred and that the company is sincerely trying to work through the conflict of forces this unfreezing has brought about. Change is occurring and will continue to occur for some time.

Some of the areas we believe have been affected by these programs in ways that will persist (refreezing) are: increased recruitment of minority persons and disadvantaged; the Black Group; increased training, education, and counseling including but not restricted to helping minorities and disadvantaged; increased awareness of and concern about the human aspect of situations; more communication channels within the organization and more skill in using them. It is also our belief that experience in confronting and working collaboratively with problems and crises which occurred during the programs has increased the number and level of resources within the company for crisis and conflict resolution. This is a gain which is of great value both within the company and in working on problems of interface between the company and its social interfaces.

2.2.6

Respondents' Perceptions

Previous sections have presented a general, overall view of the company and the programs. In this section we will identify a number of specific issues and determinants of the programs as perceived by respondents. As often as possible we have presented respondents' own statements. This poses some difficulty in classifying the statements according to specific topics since a particular statement may, by implication at least, be pertinent to more than one issue or aspect of the program.

Our purpose, however, is to help the reader understand the number and complexity of issues such programs can be expected to confront. Organizing comments around specific issues seemed a way to achieve this. The reader is urged to see the limitations of our classification and develop his own perceptions of the relationships among issues that create the total picture.

We have tried to present all views as they were presented to us during the interviews without favoring either positive or negative viewpoints. Some selection was necessary but we have tried to be sure that all viewpoints were represented.

For some this variety of views, perceptions and reactions may give a discouraging picture of great disagreement and little feeling of working together for common objectives.

For us the diversity of the comments is encouraging. For one thing it is realistic. Secondly, several interviewers were impressed by the openness of respondents in expressing their opinions and their honestly trying to understand the issues and communicate both their opinions of the situation and their feelings about it. This striving for open, honest communication is to us a healthy condition of continuing dialogue about the issues. It is this which offers a good basis for improving the programs and fulfilling their objectives. It says to us that the programs are not imposed, external formalities but an important part of the company's ongoing processes. Also, the company's policy of respecting the significance of individuals and of groups that represent the individual comes through to us. This respect for individuals and their abilities probably does not lead to neat organizational packages but is essential for vital, meaningful programs.

Please note that there is no significance to the order in which specific issues are presented. All of them are important for the program and for understanding the pattern of forces at work in such programs.

2.2.6.1

Group Activity

Two groups were perceived as performing key roles in development and implementation of the programs. These are the Grievance Committee and the Black Group.

Some perceived these groups in conflict over the issue of black versus white. Others perceived the issue as the new employees versus the old employees. A few perceived that both groups had the same aim of helping employees and that minority groups needed the kind of support that the Black Group could provide in addition to the established procedures and support offered by the Grievance Committee.

Both kinds of support are necessary for a meaningful program. Also, tension always accompanies any fundamental change. How the tension is utilized to work through the issues without smothering the tension is an important key to organizational health. It is too early to predict the patterns of organization that will result, but at this point, we believe the confrontation of issues and different kinds of support provided by these groups has been a significant part of the programs' achievement.

2.2.6.1.1

Grievance Committee

The Grievance Committee was perceived as concerned with whites and therefore biased or at least not understanding and sympathizing with the problems of minority workers. This committee was also seen as protecting privileges for older employees - specifically seniority rules. The Grievance Committee was seen also as only concerned about hourly workers.

Seniority is an important issue - accented probably during the period of study by fear of possible layoffs. Resentment was expressed of the Black Group as a threat to established patterns - particularly seniority. The Black Group it was felt "should operate within the Grievance Committee."

A respondent who participated in one of the black-white weekend sessions carried on by the company overheard a participant who was a member of the Grievance Committee say, "I guess this is just another of those 'love nigger' weekends." This caused him to feel that he, as a black, couldn't trust the Grievance Committee. Another said, "I have no regard for the Grievance Committee. I would prefer an outside representative - not necessarily a union. The Grievance Committee is completely white oriented. They only deal positively with white grievances."

Thus, in addition to racial bias, the Grievance Committee was perceived as biased by being part of the establishment. On the other hand, a respondent said, "The Grievance Committee sees that you get a fair hearing. Blacks use the Grievance Committee for things about the job."

2.2.6.1.2

Black Group

The Black Group was seen by many blacks as a major achievement both for blacks and for the company. "The Black Group is the most important change that has occurred."

The Black Group symbolized development of black influence, and the company's encouragement of it gave evidence of good faith in programs for minorities and the disadvantaged. "The Black Group is the only effective organization for black communication." There was some difference of opinion within the black community, however, "The Black Group is just a lot of northern blacks out for their own interests."

As stated above, the Black Group functioned as a clearinghouse of information for blacks, a center for counseling and encouragement, a means of facilitating communication between blacks and whites (particularly between blacks and their supervisors), and a channel for communicating black problems to management and influencing decisions.

There was resentment of the Black Group arising from their challenge to accepted organizational practice. "The Black Group is trying to fill a vacuum where none exists. There should be only one committee for employees." "The Black Group is trying to achieve recognition and influence so they can create incidents. They do things the procedures give them no right to do. Now they have official status; so they may relax."

It was recognized that the Black Group by its very existence might help polarize situations. "Anything the Black Group proposes or is identified with is seen as a racial issue. As soon as whites can identify it as racial, they don't want to be involved." This polarization or clear identification of issues seems a necessary part of the process of differentiation and confrontation required for effective change.

Action by the Black Group to let blacks know about opportunities available and encourage them to take advantage of these opportunities was seen as unfair advantage and favoritism. "The Black Group is trying to push blacks into positions the blacks themselves know they aren't qualified for." "The blacks have a whole committee just for blacks. They get secret information others don't get."

2.2.6.2

Program Issues and Reactions

This section combines respondents' comments around specific parts of the programs such as Vestibule Training and Advancement. It also presents comments on other issues which respondents identified as important, e.g. Supervisor-Worker relations, and Qualifications.

2.2.6.2

Program Issues and Reactions

Again, the order in which these issues are presented is not intended to indicate a judgement of their importance. All are important for understanding the operation of the programs and of ways such programs can be improved.

2.2.6.2.1

Vestibule Training

Respondents who were trainees from the part of the programs that we call Vestibule Training liked it and felt it had helped them.

Supervisors and management personnel recognized that some of the trainees "hadn't worked out", but felt this was the kind of thing you can expect in a new program. You have to get the bugs out by experience.

However, a respondent who had worked in placement of Vestibule Training participants had this to say. "A year ago when I got a call from Vestibule Training to place some people, 70 to 80 percent of the supervisors would say 'Yeah, I'd really like one!' Only thirty percent were reluctant or said no. Now seventy percent are saying, 'I'm happy to have blacks. I just don't want blacks from Vestibule Training'." He identified the following reasons for this. One was insufficient communication between Vestibule Training and the supervisors so that persons were sent to a job without being selected for specific job requirements. Linked with this, and an even stronger factor, was the supervisor's feeling he couldn't or wasn't given the opportunity to screen and select Vestibule Training people by interview. "The supervisors resent having to take the word of Vestibule Training. The supervisor's opinion doesn't count they feel, and, after one or two bad experiences, they freeze up. They prefer to take someone who hasn't been guaranteed a job."

Another difficulty was the lack of differential in pay between Vestibule Training and the company. "There's only 25 cents difference between Vestibule Training and the company. After they're on the job two or three days, they say 'It's just too far to come. It's not worth the money and the extra commuting time'."

The comments above confirm other information that there was significant lack of direct communication between Vestibule Training and the managers in the company as far as expectations and realities. There was a mismatch between the expectations of different parties as well as differences in their image of Vestibule Training.

Part of this mismatch may have resulted from the fact that Vestibule Training was geographically separated from the company.

2.2.6.2.1

Vestibule Training

Also, the attention of the managers of Vestibule Training was, at the beginning at least, directed primarily at dealing with the problems of getting a new operation underway rather than working out clear relations of Vestibule Training with other parts of the company.

In any case, most if not all of the information about Vestibule Training received by many managers were reports in the company newspaper, or by word of mouth. Such reports tend to be in terms of goals and objectives and some "happiness news" rather than describing realistic limitations and specific procedures for bringing trainees into the company.

It would seem that such publicity without direct communication leads to overgeneralization, overexpectation, and rumors.

Managers who visited Vestibule Training two years after it was established reported their shock at the limited scope of the reality compared with the image they had built up from the publicity. They were surprised both by the relatively small number of persons in training and the lack of facilities and programs for meaningful skill training programs.

Another difficulty with Vestibule Training is the stigma it leaves on the new worker. "This may decrease when Vestibule Training people who stay demonstrate they can make it. When a worker comes from Vestibule Training he's isolated and lost for a while so he seeks out his black brothers. Eventually he becomes part of his work group. It seems to be taking longer and longer for this to happen. Some never make the connection."

2.2.6.2.2

Supervisors And Workers

The first line supervisor, of course, is where the action is. This was recognized by all levels and there was concern both about the lack of preparation given supervisors for their new problems and ways to support them more adequately. The general feeling was that first line supervisors were doing a good to great job under great difficulties.

"I trust my supervisor who's black. He had to establish himself at first by cracking people's balls, but every supervisor has to do that at the beginning. There are only two people (in a group of thirty-seven) who don't have good relationships with him but that's their fault." A supervisor, who came across during the interviews as a person of great energy with emphasis on getting things done, also conveyed his personal warmth and concern about helping people get ahead. He saw no fundamental change and saw no problems with helping minority groups and the disadvantaged.

2.2.6.2.2

Supervisors and Workers

Supervisors were sincerely anxious to help people and many were particularly aware of the need for extra help to minority and disadvantaged persons. Their opinions of how to help and their perception of the forces influencing their decisions varied widely. Many of their comments could be viewed as illustrating problems that would be faced in any worker-supervisor relation. However, they were aware that new factors existed and, while they had to view the situation from their customary viewpoints, they were also aware that results of their actions could have unanticipated consequences. The ambiguity level was higher.

For example, one supervisor expressed his philosophy as, "You have to get everything clear at the start, and then there's no trouble. Everybody knows the score and then you abide by it." His objective was an efficient, productive, "no nonsense" operation. In discussing particular cases, however, he made it clear that he saw the people he supervised as individuals with special needs who required different approaches in order to "get everything clear" as well as needing support. He found no difficulty in coping with entrance of minority groups and disadvantaged persons.

Another saw the development of new power structues as increasing the difficulties of both supervisors and managers. For him the significant power groups were the senior (old time) employees and the blacks. Both groups could carry their problems to the top and bypass their supervisors. When this happened, supervisors were left with feelings of frustration and inadequacy. His experience indicated the probability of such by-passing was only two percent. Nevertheless, the possibility of such short circuiting of supervisors and middle management was a threat which he believed cause "disproportionate" attention to behavior of minority persons and senior employees.

There was also the issue of how a supervisor's attempts to help an employee would be seen by other employees. In one case a supervisor worked to help a black employee in spite of the feedback from other employees that the supervisor was "soft" and that the black employee was taking advantage of him and laughing at him. The supervisor felt, however, he had done the best he could and was reasonably comfortable with having lived up to his principles and responsibilities as he saw them. He also felt that other employees understood what he was trying to do and did not feel that the help he tried to give the individual was unfair to them.

Another supervisor said, "I make my decisions on the basis of qualifications. When blacks complained they weren't getting what they deserved, I explained what I based my decisions on and my supervisor backed me up. It didn't affect the blacks' attitude."

2.2.6.2.2

Supervisors and Workers

In some cases the supervisors were perceived as being intimidated by the black issue and thus favoring blacks. One respondent said, "My supervisor reprimanded a black for absence, and, as she left his office, she slammed the door and shouted, 'You son of a bitch!', but he didn't open the door. A black can get away with it. When a black left the assembly line, nothing was said when she came back the next day. If she'd been white, she'd have been fired." Another respondent believed "line supervisors try to avoid conflict by giving in. They should have principles and make everyone meet the same standards." In addition to the black-white issue another comment added the male-female issue: "The bosses are scared of blacks so they don't force them to work - at least the men. Only the men are allowed to goof off. Girls are told to go back to work if they so much as lift a finger."

There was a good deal of very positive reaction to supervisors' behavior from both white and black employees. This included awareness that it's a two-way street. "My supervisor is wide open. You can go to him with any problem. He responds positively and takes everything into consideration. Some people have built-in black-white prejudice against supervisors. They can't see supervisors as individuals and can't hear them." Even when a supervisor was perceived as biased, his ability to listen gave him many points. "My supervisor was very prejudiced and I told him so. He said, 'What am I doing wrong?' I told him and he's really trying to change his attitudes."

There was also comment that separated the sheep from the goats - in favor of the supervisor. "The supervisors are very fair. It's personnel and the managers who open the gates to them."

2.2.6.2.3

Supervisors and Management

While most supervisors felt they would have the support of their management, this was often support after the fact. Many supervisors as well as managers spoke of the lack of guidance before the fact, particularly in problems of dealing with minority personnel and the disadvantaged.

A supervisor's comment seems to state the problem clearly: "A line supervisor is in a real crunch. He needs clear guidelines so he knows where his support is. Instead, he's left defenseless in a gray zone. I had to fire two blacks and some people got shook up about it. I had to fill out a form with several copies justifying it. One of the copies went to the Black Group. At first I really resented that. Then I realized they were trying to help these people, and that I really was afraid I'd have to explain my actions to them. I didn't think I'd get much support from my boss especially on

2.2.6.2.3

Supervisors and Management

a ticklish racial problem. If the Black Group got involved, I'd be in the middle against everyone. Management doesn't want problems so the people in direct contact have to face the problems."

Increased feedback of information about decisions was suggested as a means to improve the supervisors' ability to cope. "There's almost total confusion of what the supervisor's job is. There's been some improvement. They're beginning to distribute a file of precedents. The file describes cases grieved and discusses the process - what happened, what the decision was, and why. This helps us understand the issues."

One supervisor said, "There was a great deal of pressure from our bosses to take these people and work with them, but they didn't give us much in the way of guidelines. They didn't help us. Just said 'Do it'." Others didn't perceive this pressure. "I don't feel any pressure from above to hire blacks, and I don't think any other supervisors are under such pressure."

Confirmation of the lack of guidance and support came from a manager who said, "I didn't do anything to prepare them for people coming from Vestibule Training. I just told them they were coming and to work with them and be sure they were treated fairly. Supervisors should be able to handle anything. It's part of what's expected of their job."

There were positive changes in supervisor-management relations, as well as among supervisors. There was more communication and greater visibility. "These programs have increased the supervisor's visibility so higher management now talks to him. Also, there is more sharing of problems and experiences with other supervisors," and, "Supervisors are more open in discussing their problems with each other." However, a supervisor concerned about the new sources of influence in the company said this issue was not discussed openly with their superiors.

Leaving room for individual initiative is one of the values strongly accepted in this company. Achieving an effective balance between this challenging freedom and needed guidance can be difficult. A manager said, "Corporate management doesn't give any guidance. This is a consistent pattern. This is good in leaving managers and supervisors free to act, but it can be a problem because there's so much ambiguity. The supervisor doesn't have positive support although he usually gets support after the fact."

2.2.6.2.4

Paternalism

Paternalism, as used here, refers to a management attitude toward employees of looking after their welfare and feeling responsible for their doing the "right" thing as judged by the elders. This is accompanied by management's feeling of responsibility for employees' actions, and a feeling of betrayal when employees deviate from "right" paths. Paternalism is also expressed by its reciprocal, the employees' attitude of dependency on the company including looking for signals from above to determine "right" behavior.

Paternalism was evidenced in many ways. In some cases the words used indicated the attitude. Talking about the difficulty of determining when people were ready for responsibility and how they were often not able to make this assessment for themselves, a manager said, "I'm not going to let my son smash up my Cadillac just to prove he isn't ready to drive."

An illustrative case, widely known and frequently cited, was that of a young black who, from the company's viewpoint, had been treated as a favored son, but influenced by evil companions, had become radical and was publicly reviling the company's policies and actions. The reaction was that of a parent toward an ungrateful child. Where did we go wrong in carrying out our parental duties? "The most important thing is a clear contract of expectations, constraints, and rewards. He was given a routine job but inadequate supervision to see that he stayed on the job. Then he got the sales department interested in his pictures and was given a roving assignment with a car to take pictures wherever he wanted to. Now he's calling us Fascist pigs." "He was influenced by the Panthers in spite of the fact that he was given everything including a car and was practically on the president's staff."

Another case, not as widely known, involved a black of great ability who, having become dissatisfied with his advancement, left the company. "An employee should be willing to wait for the employer's judgement about when he's ready to be promoted - based on a mutually understood and agreed contract of expectations. He wouldn't wait for approval of his promotion, but he should have. His leaving is a real loss to the company." The flavor is of the son's ingratitude and disrespect for the father's judgement.

2.2.6.2.5

Training

The push to increase the number of minority group and disadvantaged personnel has brought a large increase in training activities. This was a conscious part of the program as described above. A large part of the increase was in training which would help minority persons and disadvantaged although the training was open to all employees. In addition to official

2.2.6.2.5

Training

training programs, many supervisors (particularly staff positions) spoke of working out development programs with individual employees of minority or disadvantaged background.

In-house training in skills and crafts was seen as the most effective means of breaking through the barriers to entry of minority and disadvantaged personnel into skilled trades. Many of these skilled trade training programs depend on a commitment from the departments reflecting the need of those departments for specific skills. Other training programs, such as the high school equivalency program, are not directed at or limited to specific departments, but aim for upgrading human resources of company-wide value.

Training activities appear to be used in at least four ways: upgrading of human resources, training in specific skills needed by the company, taking up slack or change in employment needs thus avoiding layoffs, and retaining particularly skilled people (as instructors) when regular positions are unavailable.

Decisions on kinds of training, extent, and objectives are influenced by supervisors, management, the Black Group, the Grievance Committee, and Training staff. One respondent perceived this mixture as "political games", but it would seem to be the negotiation process necessary in a healthy organization where all elements affected can influence the decision.

Training is open to all employees but for some training there are more applicants than training "slots" available. Therefore, there is often a good deal of maneuvering among whites, blacks, and senior (older) employees to secure these slots. This, of course, calls into play the Black Group and the Grievance Committee.

Militant blacks felt there should be training reserved exclusively for minority groups. Their rationale was twofold: "to take care of results of past discrimination", and "so they can compete on equal terms. One or two blacks out of ten is just tokenism."

For other reasons, training staff saw advantages in homogeneous groupings. "The minority and disadvantaged persons aren't able to keep up with the others; so a trainer has to work for different levels of achievement with the same group."

Considerations of seniority in selecting applicants for training led to the comment that, "They're trying to turn training into an old men's home." This was, however, part of an effort by management to help older employees develop new resources to aid them in adjusting to a changing technology.

2.2.6.2.6

Qualifications

There was strong feeling by many that qualification standards had been lowered through favoritism to minority groups and disadvantaged. This also came out in reverse, as it were, by the concern that people (influenced by their desire to be "equal") strive for and obtain positions for which they are unqualified. Some saw this as political manipulation by minority groups which exploit the individual for the group's purpose of increasing the level of black positions. "They used persons as political pawns and forced them into situations they were unable to handle." There was general agreement by supervisors and managers that putting persons into positions for which they were not ready or not suited was destructive both for the individual and the company.

Cases were cited including: "He was a genius in his craft but he requested and got an office job. Now he needs more academic training to advance so he's left frustrated." In the case of a black who was reluctant to take a supervisory position but was persuaded to do so, it was now felt he "couldn't cut the mustard. The men don't respect him." Management was baffled by this since, "He appeared to have all the qualifications." This comment makes clear the legitimate need for experienced judgement to assess qualifications. Few positions above the technical skill level have qualifications which can be stated so they can be assessed by a routine process.

A supervisor who took a black, even though he was not fully qualified technically, worked with him more than a year, but "He never quite made it, and others were aware he wasn't contributing his full share." When opportunity arose in another area, the supervisor encouraged him to take it, but he still wonders whether this was the easy way out. Another supervisor said, "Maybe the company expects too much of black supervisors who don't have the background to compete with the top-drawer managers and supervisors that are the general run here."

All persons interviewed agreed that persons should be "qualified" but there were differences in meaning. The dilemma was clear from two comments by different respondents. "People should be brought in if qualified. I don't like having special programs for particular groups," versus, "I believe in equal treatment but blacks might need more help to get entry jobs - some extra preparation so they can get equal consideration."

What the qualifications should be and who should assess whether the qualifications were met was another tricky part of the question. From a black viewpoint, "Whites are so blocked by their emotional reaction to blacks they can't give

2.2.6.2.6

Qualifications

them a fair shake. People shouldn't be put into positions for which they're not qualified, but whites can't see a black's qualifications. Dropping the high school qualification was just a trick. They just added other requirements a black can't meet." A black who picked a black for a position was questioned by others (mainly whites), who had interviewed the applicants also, whether the black was picked because he was black or because he was qualified. The response was: "He met specific qualifications for a specific situation. Qualifications change as the situation changes. Later in the project I might not have picked the black."

Whether the effort to bring in minority persons and the disadvantaged had operated to set aside qualifications, and particularly to discriminate against other applicants was of great concern. There were many shades of opinion as to whether this overriding of qualifications had indeed occurred. "A lot of people said that blacks should be favored, but there's been very little. A lot of talk but not much action." However, the feeling was also expressed that management was not being honest about their basis for selection of employees competing for "posted" positions (positions advertised within the company). Management, they said, did not state openly that a certain percentage of the vacancies was reserved for persons of minority groups although results showed this was the case. Also, persons spoke of competing with blacks for posted jobs, then after a black was selected, being assigned to help him (or her) learn his job.

The decision process for selecting among persons competing for jobs within the company was identified as a sequential process involving two factors: "first a person's ability to do the job within a reasonable time, and then seniority." With respect to outside hiring a respondent outlined the program as, "We give preference in original hiring to persons of minority groups and train them on the job. We've change job requirements to cut out non-essentials such as high school graduation but there's been no change in rules for seniority."

The main effect of management surveillance to encourage selection of minority and disadvantaged personnel would seem to be in decisions about "potential" - whether the applicant can do the job within a reasonable time. The surveillance encourages higher risks in favor of the minority and disadvantaged. "If two employees are equally qualified, I would probably take the black."

2.2.6.2.7

Conflict of Goals

For supervisors and managers alike the double goals of product and people was a continuing problem. For many it wasn't clear how much weight to give to product or to people when these seemed in conflict. Values of the individual

2.2.6.2.7

Conflict of Goals

supervisor or manager were considered the more important determinants of supervisor and management performance rather than company policy which wasn't all that clear. "I agree with the president's real values. Production is the first priority, then people problems." This ambiguity was increasing. "The president wants us to create a 'dynamic growth environment' but at the same time products are more and more complex and the time schedule for producing is shorter. So there isn't room to do anything significant about the second aim (people)."

This ambiguity about goals was believed to reflect an unresolved conflict among top management. "The line supervisor is caught in the squeeze between two goals - productivity and human relations - which above his level don't talk to each other." For another respondent this ambiguity reflected a lack of understanding between the president and his staff. "The president has lost touch with the organization. His lieutenants didn't understand or accept his policy of people being our second product." For some this perceived lack of agreement among staff meant less trust of upper management. "Their signals are too conflicting."

The two aims have also raised issues among supervisors expressed by one respondent as, "Other supervisors aren't concerned with people so any supervisor who is concerned about people gets shafted by getting the problem persons." The example he cited involved employment of several whites and one black. On the plea that their work was in more of a crisis, the other supervisors took the white applicants and left him with the black employee. At the time he saw the black employee as a serious problem which the other supervisors were unwilling to share. At this point he was delighted that he had taken the risk, particularly since it had worked out very well. But the message was that productivity took precedence over people for most supervisors. This message was reflected also in the comment that, "People are our second aim but everyone's aware that no one gets promoted for his second aim."

A manager who sympathized with the president's goals also felt lack of guidance. "I agree with the president's objectives, but he never tells us how we are to do this. We have to meet production schedules and at the same time be idealistic. The supervisors are in the middle trying to work with more people problems while keeping up a high production. Not much is done to help them."

2.2.6.2.8

Fairness and Favoritism

Fairness is always an issue in any human organization. With the introduction of large numbers of minority people and disadvantaged who need extra support and encouragement, and who operate with somewhat different values the issue of fairness increases.

2.2.6.2.8 Fairness and Favoritism

The fairness issue is expressed in many forms one of which is concern about whether the standard of qualifications is being adhered to. Another form is whether other employees are getting better treatment than I am. For example, there was the concern whether employees in other divisions "were getting something we aren't". This concern was reported as particularly active during initial stages of the programs but less active now.

It is helpful in interpreting this process, as well as others, to realize that the informal network of communication among divisions within the local metropolitan area is both prolific and active. Many persons go from one division to another and often have "contacts" in all of them. In a sense, the company is an open community with functional subgroupings, the divisions.

Two viewpoints of fairness were expressed. One was that everyone should be treated the same way, judged by the same standards, and with the same standard of rewards and punishments for everyone. Another was that everyone should be treated in terms of his individual needs and allowance made in applying standards for an employee's background and social pressures.

Irregularity in attendance, or absence, is a critical issue both because of the interdependence of jobs and the company's policy of assuring forty hours pay each week. In a case where an employee was in jail for an extended period, the supervisor defined fairness as "recognizing that each employee's needs are unique and we must try to support him," and kept him on the payroll. Many respondents agreed with this approach although some felt it necessary to examine the moral or social aspect of the act that got him in jail.

Another viewpoint was that, "The company shouldn't have to adapt to individuals. Personal problems should be left at home; otherwise they cause discrimination and lower standards."

A proponent of the single standard said, "The only way to be fair is not to use two standards. You must think through each situation carefully, and be able to tell the worker and anybody else how you made the decisions." This view, of course, does not necessarily rule out consideration of the employee's individual needs.

There were also comments which expressed resentment at the unfairness of others receiving help that respondents had not received. "I worked hard and nobody gave me any special consideration. Blacks should start at entry jobs and work themselves up like everyone else. Nobody handed us anything."

2.2.6.2.8 Fairness and Favoritism

Also, "The president is unfair to concentrate on only one group. There are others groups equally deserving."

Part of the feeling of unfairness seemed to derive from an attitude that the new minority group employees and the disadvantaged were threatening the opportunities for older employees. "The company should do more for people like me. We'd like some upgrading also," and "I respect the president for trying to be a good egg, but he should take care of his own first."

2.2.6.2.9 The Old and The New

An important factor in the tensions arising from bringing in large numbers of minority groups and disadvantaged is the tension between old and new employees. The "one big family" attitude is part of it. It's always difficult for a newcomer to gain entry and be accepted as part of the family's ongoing relationships. One of the employees, who's been with the company for several years, commented that, "The first two or three months for any new employee in this company is hell!"

This resistance was sharpened by perception that these newcomers were or could be threats to vested interests and accepted practices such as seniority. Several respondents saw the confrontations between old and new employees as equally if not more important than person, racial, or cultural differences. They perceived that in many cases this tension between old and new employees was the basic tension that was translated into black-white terms.

Senior (older) employees resented new employees taking advantage of company benefits such as educational programs. "They've just come and they're grabbing everything."

An employee remembering her entry said, "When I first came there was a bitterness in the air. Whenever I left my seat to get a part, I found someone sitting in my chair when I got back. I thought they wanted me to start a fight. There were many acts like this. It wasn't because I was black because both blacks and whites did it. They were older employees who resented the new people. I just ignored it, and suddenly they quit. They've been nice ever since."

Another explanation of this reaction is that the new employees became scapegoats for the employees' anger and fear about the consequences of these programs for their own future. Many older employees defended the company and the programs while laying the blame for changed conditions on "them" - the new employees.

2.2.6.2.9

The Old
and
The New

One example of the difficulty of interpretation was the Volunteer Fund. When there was reason to expect a reduction in force, a group of employees asked everyone to contribute voluntarily to a fund which could be used to mitigate the effects of such a layoff if it occurred. It was never clearly specified how the fund was to be used. While some employees saw this as a thrust in the right direction, others were displeased: "This is only for the blacks." "The fund's not a good idea because it could affect established seniority procedures." "I was against it because it was never made clear how it was to be used." "We had to take layoffs in our time; why should they be different?" These comments show that persons opposed to the fund had, or at least expressed, many different motives.

Many persons contributed to the fund but the result was significantly less than hoped. One respondent said only three percent of employees contributed. A respondent saw this as indicating that, "When the chips are down, reaction to minorities is negative." But the comments above indicate that, while reaction to minorities may well have caused part of the non-response, fear of new employees endangering established seniority procedures, as well as reluctance to buy a pig in a poke were also partial causes.

2.2.6.2.10

Productivity

Productivity it was believed had, on the whole, increased somewhat, but this was achieved because of improved technology. Without the improved technology, productivity it was believed would have declined. "There's no decrease in production. If anything there's been an increase, but some of that is due to machines."

2.2.6.2.11

Reaction to
Minorities

This section presents reactions to black minority persons from three viewpoints: blacks' reactions to blacks, Italian reaction to blacks, and other whites' reactions to blacks. This seems the best way to grasp the complexity and variations of the reaction process.

Many white people are so blocked by the color of skin they are unaware of the great differences in attitudes and values that exist within the category of "black". Blacks do not have this handicap and are keenly aware of differences among them. Differentiations are drawn with regard to blacks from the West Indies (Caribbean), the southern states of the U.S.A. and the northern states. A black from the Caribbean expressed what would be considered conservative white values when he said, "People can make it if they try and they have an obligation to try." The experience from which this attitude arose was expressed as, "I had no experience with discrimination until I came to the United States."

2.2.6.2.11

Reaction to Minorities

A black from the southern states expressed a difference he perceived. "People in the South, black or white, can trust each other to keep confidences but not in the North." Another viewpoint from the South was that, "Northern blacks are just trying to make good by white men's standards." Still another black person from the South saw northern blacks as afraid to confront the issue of discrimination. "Black people up north don't want to face the fact of discrimination. They say 'We don't have discrimination here like you do down South.' We went to a restaurant here and weren't waited on for an hour. When I wanted to speak to the manager, my friends tried to keep me from it. They wanted to explain it away. It may be more subtle here but it's the same. Many problems in the company are black-white, but blacks don't want to face up to how whites really feel about them and treat them."

A black supervisor felt that the few blacks who are above the level of first line supervisors are "black caucasians." "They don't want any trouble. They won't say or do anything to ruffle management's feathers. They don't like me because I stand up for my rights." Some confirmation of this was offered by a white supervisor who said, "Two of the black supervisors failed because they couldn't change their values to match the company's. You can't change behavior without changing your values. The blacks who make it are black only in color."

Blacks are individuals with a great variety of opinions and attitudes. The biggest difference is between blacks who believe that most whites cannot see them as people until the blacks establish their identity and significance as blacks with influence and ability to be heard versus those blacks who try to make it by conforming to white middle class values or at least without confronting the system.

This was reflected in the term "white nigger". Two interpretations were given: "blacks who have made it, and then deny their race" and "persons who have got to some position of influence, and then use it to get even with whites."

The reaction of whites of Italian ancestry to blacks was more intense than that of other whites. The feeling expressed was deep resentment that the blacks were receiving help which had been denied Italians. Several respondents were second generation Italians whose families and themselves had experienced severe discrimination. Now they saw blacks threatening the positions they had struggled for with great effort and deprivation, and they resented the favors extended these interlopers. This reaction was expressed both as individual resentment of favors they perceived given others, and as the reaction of a cohesive

2.2.6.2.11

Reaction to Minorities

ethnic group to outsiders. An Italian worker, who was able to relate to blacks as individuals, spoke of this. "If blacks tried to move into the North End (an Italian community), they were thrown out in the street." He wanted to invite a black fellow worker to his wedding but at another wedding "Blacks were invited to dinner, but when they sat down all the other people at the table moved. I don't want my friend subjected to that." This kept him from asking other fellow workers so he wouldn't appear to be discriminating.

Reactions from other whites were both positive and negative. The positive reactions seemed to come from people who had been able to know individual blacks as persons, and the negative reaction from persons who perceived blacks as a large, unknown, threatening group. The distinction was clear in the comment that, "Most of the blacks I work with are all right, but most of them are shiftless, arrogant, and lazy."

There were comments that "They have no understanding of responsibility--no idea of progressing by learning the work thoroughly. They think they're entitled to be given things without working for them," and "A large portion of blacks are lazy and take advantage of the system." "When work is assigned, whites know they have to carry the load and get the job done. You can't depend on blacks because they don't take assignments seriously."

These reactions were countered by a white who said, "Blacks speak up more constructively more often than whites. They are more direct, less trouble making." More than one supervisor agreed with the comment that, "Blacks have more desire for self improvement and more initiative in doing something about it. Whites are more complacent," and "Most blacks realize they're disadvantaged and have to work harder to succeed. They're realistic. There's no question that, if they're given an opportunity, a high percentage will work out well."

A white supervisor from the South said, "When I came here I expected to find different attitudes toward blacks - no prejudice. The only difference is that here prejudice is expressed on the side. In the South it's just more open." Another said, "I don't express myself because I might be considered racist."

Two comments suggested that the way people were selected and the way they were treated was more important in their acceptance than race. "There's no problem when blacks are hustlers. Give the edge to minorities but look for right attitudes." "Results have been plus and minus. Plus when

2.2.6.2.11

Reaction to Minorities

persons brought in are eager to learn and in a situation which encourages this. Minus when a person just wants to get what he can or it's company tokenism with no real work so they just sit around playing cards."

A fair amount of the negative reaction to minorities was caused by those blacks who lacked customary middle class behavior patterns in such matters as aggressiveness, dress, cleanness, and respect for property. A girl who lived in an integrated middle class community with black friends there said, "I'm afraid of being attacked - by girls not men. They were constantly making remarks. They wore shameful, revealing clothes, and the restroom was filthy."

Reaction to dress was mixed. A supervisor said, "The company is more tolerant of dress and hairdos. We give uniformed employees an allowance to go to Anderson-Little and buy what they want. Some buy bell bottoms, etc. which is fine with us." Another comment, however, was, "I know I'm conservative and I was really put off by his dashiki, beads, and amulet." "You know - afros, dashikis, whales' teeth. We laugh about it among ourselves. Why are they wearing these things? What are they trying to prove? Are they really happy with these clothes, or trying to say something to us?"

An interesting and significant comment came from a white employee who had grown up in the ghetto with many black friends and feeling very comfortable with them. "Suddenly I began to feel superior to them. Now I'm afraid of them."

2.2.6.2.12

Reaction of Minorities

As one would expect from the above comments on reactions to minorities, reactions of minorities are also a mixed bag. The general impression received is that although much has been achieved much more effort is needed before the openness, sharing and trust that indicate meaningful acceptance is achieved by minority groups. We believe that the "three generations" estimated by one respondent as the time required for such change is unnecessarily long if continued effort is made on both sides. Nevertheless, the goal probably requires years of such association, interaction, and effort.

One black employee saw this clearly when he said "It helps to have a black supervisor because he can read between the lines. Communication needs common experience. With the white guys the only thing we share is work and casual talk about sports. We don't have any personal sharing. They accept me as long as I stay in my place and do what they expect. At lunch someone used the word 'nigger' in something he was saying. I didn't hear it or take it personally. Later all

2.2.6.2.12

Reaction of Minorities

the other men came and apologized for the man who said it. I felt they were up-tight because one of them had used the word. They weren't really worried about me. Probably they're not able to feel about me as a person."

There were comments from blacks that, "We don't want favoritism, just the opportunity to show what we can do." This reaction against paternalism and concessions came up in connection with a case where a black had a poor attendance record. The persons who pressed most for his summary punishment were other blacks "who saw his poor attendance as a reflection on them."

There was reaction of black employees to others' behavior or their interpretation of this behavior. Behavior of supervisors carried a much larger message than behavior of fellow workers. To some extent it was realized that supervisors were also individuals, but they necessarily represented the company. If the company did not explicitly disapprove of the supervisor's action, this was ipso facto approval. There was the assumption that "the company" was a cohesive group with commonly shared attitudes and norms which the actions of the supervisors were in some way expressing.

It is particularly difficult for a person of minority or disadvantaged background with limited experience of organizational dynamics to get any clear picture of the operations of this company - a picture by which he can identify his place and his significance within it. Indeed, this company with its variety of groupings and influence structures baffles many experienced persons when they try to see it as a coherent whole. The behavior of the supervisor is one of the main vehicles available to the employee for getting the "picture".

Minority employees reaction to this ambiguity was expressed by such comments as, "Things are left indefinite so they can pull the wool over your eyes. The main thing is don't rock the boat. They have a double standard - what they say and what they do. They operate with phantom records passed along by supervisors that an employee can't see." These comments indicate the credibility gap caused by messages and behavior that the employee doesn't have the information to interpret coupled with the assumption that "management" is a unified body with a single viewpoint.

Racial issues in work groups seemed to be a function of the number of minority persons. "The two blacks in the group are widely separated so they're seen as individuals not members of a black group." Another black perceived he wasn't accepted because he was always the last to be told anything.

2.2.6.2.12

Reaction of Minorities

He felt lonely and cut off from his fellow workers. Another, who spoke of the difficulty of gaining acceptance, saw it as a matter of work cliques rather than color.

There were respondents who agreed with the reactions of a black who saw the actions of his supervisor as a pattern of betrayal by a person who doesn't like blacks. This respondent said, "I've lost my initiative and am just coasting along." There were also respondents who saw the personal concern expressed by fellow employees when the individual was suffering as an indication of acceptance. An example was the black who spoke of the visits and gifts from fellow employees he received when he was in the hospital for an extended period plus the fact of his supervisor's keeping his job for him.

2.2.6.2.13

Community Relations

The company has given a good deal of support to various community activities both in the ghetto and in other depressed areas. When this question was raised, the only comments were with respect to funds donated to a community center in a depressed area. A white employee who doesn't live in the area saw the result as negative. "The money was used to bring in undesirable young people, so persons I know who live here are afraid to go out of their houses. It certainly hasn't improved conditions." However, a black employee who lives in the area and is active in community affairs said, "Things are going well. The company has helped the community progress."

2.2.6.2.14

Changes

The complexity of the company's operating procedures and its long established policy of concern for individuals and flexibility to meet their needs made it difficult for respondents to pinpoint specific changes. Another reason for this difficulty may be that changes in this company are often not made by official fiat but develop gradually from continuous pressure of interested groups so that people become accustomed to the new patterns as they evolve and may not perceive the change. "I can't see any change but the company has always been so indefinite and people oriented it's hard to detect specific change." Some of the changes of this type such as the Black Group and the increasing complexity of the supervisor's position partially due to new influence structures have been spoken of above.

One respondent who didn't see much change said, "There's more communication both among peers and with management. Management appears concerned about everybody in the plant. They try to avoid layoffs and provide education and training." "The company has given real meaning to its words by these programs. There's no effective change in promotion, but hiring of minorities is much better." "There's very little

2.2.6.2.14

Changes

organization change as a result of the special programs. The programs haven't affected the production and profit status of the company."

The most obvious change was the change in entry requirements to make them more relevant by dropping the requirement for high school graduation. But perceptions of other change ranged from "none because of craft skill requirements", to "an increase in people's understanding of others' viewpoints. There is some gain in tolerance, concern about equality, and ability to reconcile differences." Several respondents agreed that, "Communication among supervisors has improved somewhat." There was also perception that "The change is there's more vandalism, uncleanness, and thievery."

Other respondents said, "All the company has done for minorities is give them more money. I don't think there's been any change". Still others said, "There are many more opportunities for blacks coming now. The company is more sensitive to their needs. Ten years ago blacks couldn't get jobs here."

A supervisor said, "There's more trust between the workers and me since I have to talk to them more about their problems. Also, there's more trust among the supervisors because we share more problems and our experience."

2.2.6.2.15

Advancement

Many respondents agreed that the number one priority in this phase of the programs was the career advancement of minority persons and disadvantaged. There are relatively few blacks in supervisory or management positions. To accomplish this by promotion from within seems likely to require change in promotional criteria and practices which would be a major change with possibly major repercussions. Management was concerned about the fact that several promising black persons had left for opportunities outside the company. Some fraction of these might return at a higher level, but this was questionable.

Respondents said, "There are many at entry level but few at supervisory and management level. When they can see blacks at higher levels it gives them hope." "We're going to have to bring them in at the managerial level." "The number one priority now is having minority persons at all levels. But this isn't possible. The reaction would be so bad it would kill the programs." "Minorities haven't received promotions. There's a lot of talk about helping blacks but when you look around you realize very few blacks are promoted."

CASE HISTORY: TRANSPORTATION COMPANY

2.3

Transportation Company

After six months of exploration and participation in planning meetings, this company did not wish to participate in the systematic data gathering part of the study. Therefore, we have no interviews nor questionnaires from employees of the company, except conversations with a few employees from a restricted number of units. Thus, the material presented below is based on our observations and casual interviews.

The transportation company is one of the leaders in the world with a reputation of being efficiently run and of having an attitude of person relationship toward its employees. The company undertook a systematic program for hiring disadvantaged both through its own recruitment and training and through the auspices of a NAB-JOBS program. Due to the type of operations, the company has had to carry on intensive skill training for its jobs. The company has units and installations in many separate locations, with each unit having a varying amount of autonomy according to the type of function. The company had minority persons who were well groomed and highly trained individuals in various scattered positions as well as in positions in direct contact with the public.

2.3.1

Development of Program

The new president of a few years, brought in as a professional manager from outside the company, set as one of his priorities a policy of bringing in minority personnel at all levels. He set the broad policy while holding staff planning conferences for implementation with top managerial personnel. Top management's interest in the programs was seen by many individuals in the company as a straightforward manpower concern to acquire people to fill low level and relatively unskilled jobs, to desegregate the company so as to improve its image with "visible" front desk minority personnel, and to be a pace setter in the industry and in the nation. Also, the company did feel a social responsibility to national problems and issues. The extent of this we did not assess.

In the maintenance and services section, there began a JOBS program for the disadvantaged covering entry jobs. To manage this program, a line manager of many years experience in the company as a middle manager was selected from a group of volunteers for the position of system coordinator and manager. He was motivated by a strong sense of social mission in accepting this job of funding and carrying out a program in conformance with requirements of the federal program. The program started slowly at first in one unit and

2.3.1

Development of Program

in one geographical area with gradual expansion to other units and areas of the company.

The program started off, then, with the strong support of the chief executive, translated also into top management action, and with enough of an emotional push throughout the company to give the program an organizational setting and context. Early in the program, after funding and scope was established, and at the suggestion of organizational specialists in the personnel and training department, a week-long human relations training session was held. The participants were counsellors and other staff of the program and line managers, of as high a rank as possible, from the installation where the program would be operating. These sessions focused on issues of race, communication, and team building between the line managers and persons operating the program quite a number of whom were black. A few managers were included in these sessions from installations where the program was not yet in operation.

From reports and observations, these human relations training sessions were considered a success. Individual managers found them a significant personal experience, and also felt that they obtained a better feel for the program and its problems. Authentic human interaction took place which gave them more understanding of themselves as persons and as members of racial groups. Both the program specialists and line managers built bridges with each other that went beyond formal role responsibilities. From what we saw and heard, these relationships were an important process that served to bolster the program as it progressed. We were not able to talk with nor meet any persons who might have come away from the sessions with any significant reservations about the sessions or about the program

With the economic recession becoming apparent in 1970 and with corporate manpower projections indicating the need for less personnel in the period ahead, it was felt that there was no sense in continuing the program. Transfers of the persons working with the program were arranged to various line capacities in regular jobs.

2.3.2

Changes

What seemed to be some changes occurring in the company? During the time we were in direct contact with the company, several processes stood out. First, there seemed to be a spread of counseling and educational functions to the benefit of other persons besides trainees of the program. Counsellors began to be accepted as people with special skills and contacts who could and were willing to help persons not in the program. Second, there grew the recognition by top management of the need for a training program geared to first line supervisors

2.3.2

Changes

which would develop general skills in dealing with people. This supervisory program was not intended to deal solely or primarily with issues of the disadvantaged or blacks. Third, there occurred a self initiated and direct confrontation between a few black salaried personnel and the chief executive which lead to recognition by the company that there was no coherent up-grading program for any of its personnel. Some of the corporate staff and board were surprised to see how little they knew about some of the operating issues in the company and the gaps in the company's policies. Besides initiating a study and policy group on promotion, this confrontation brought an increased amount of communication between top management and various echelons of the company. This confrontation episode was perceived by employees as a dramatic by-pass in communication and responsibility. Fourth, the company found that, in most areas, the presence of black personnel and other minorities in contact with the public was taken in stride by people in the company as well as the general public.

2.3.3

Expectations

Looking ahead from that period, we can expect some issues to surface. First, the careful selection and training carried on for these positions suggests that the persons in these jobs may well be "overqualified" and will expect rapid mobility to higher positions. This expectation of more rapid promotion coupled with the opening of opportunities in other companies and in other fields suggests as an organizational issue that numbers of these persons may well move from the company. Second, the minority groups were starting to become a coherent group as a result of the confrontation process. The organization now had to identify the needs of other blacks in the company to see whether their needs agreed with those expressed by the self appointed spokesman who precipitated the confrontation. Also, there was the question of which black group should be dealt with to improve the situation. Third, the replacement of blacks and other minorities as their acquired skills facilitates their movement means there will have to be a continuing effort, at least on the numerical level, of recruiting and training.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES AND ATTITUDES

3.0

Changes from Programs

Data from questionnaires will be the primary source of material in this section. Three hundred and ninety eight questionnaires were useable, 128 from the service company and 270 from the manufacturing company. Almost half of the persons completing questionnaires were also interviewed. Respondents' length of service in their company ranged from less than one year to those with more than fifteen years of service (about

3.0 Changes from Programs

ten percent). A little less than one quarter of respondents were black with a slightly higher percentage of black respondents from the service company than from the manufacturing company.

No claim is made for representativeness of the data. Respondents who were not interviewed were quota matched with the interviewees, but, basically, they were a volunteer group.

In the first part of this discussion we survey respondents' overall perception and response on change (Section 3.1). Then we examine characteristics of respondents such as Length of Service (Section 3.2), Racial and Cultural Background (Section 3.3), and Level of Position (Section 3.4) as they are associated with variations in the data. Lastly, we examine the relations between respondents' conservative-militant orientation and perceptions of change in the variables studied (Section 3.5).

3.1 Perceived "Better" or "Worse"

In the table accompanying this section, summary data results for both companies are reported. Overall, it is sharply clear that respondents saw that "people in the company (other than people brought in by the special programs) have changed in the way they related to other people", for the better. Nine of the twenty areas of organization processes studied were rated by at least fifty percent of the respondents as "better" or "much better." In descending rank order of percentage magnitude these areas are: money for training and education (about seventy-five percent), community relations, communications, getting along with people, talking with higher management, hiring practices, concern with individual welfare, personal achievement, teamwork, and promotion. (Appendix 1 contains the questionnaire forms. Appendix 3 contains tables of selected data with breakdowns by years of service, racial and cultural background, and levels of position in the company. These tables show both overall totals as well as separate results for each of the companies.)

The percentages of respondents perceiving change as "worse" and "much worse" are much smaller than respondents with positive views. The highest percentage of respondents reporting negative reaction is around twenty-five percent for "reaction to new behavior or dress." In descending order of negative reaction are trust, favoritism, hiring practices, layoff processes, fairness in assigning work, productivity, and promotion (fifteen percent). In other words, perceptions of better conditions overall, outweigh by at least twice the proportion of those who saw worsening of relationships.

The data confirm our observations and interviews, namely, that, while there is some degree of dissatisfaction, perceived

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

(Summary All Companies **)

	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
Process Variable	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Communication	19.6	45.3	26.1	7.1	1.5	100.0	398
Teamwork	14.0	37.7	37.0	8.7	2.6	100.0	392
Getting Along With People	20.5	42.3	26.8	9.1	1.3	100.0	396
Productivity	11.6	29.6	42.5	12.9	3.4	100.0	388
Judging Work	12.8	31.1	46.5	7.4	2.2	100.0	367
Concern for Individual's Welfare	23.1	36.1	29.0	8.2	3.6	100.0	389
Talking to Higher Management	26.2	35.7	32.8	3.8	1.5	100.0	390
Personal Achievement	19.2	36.2	38.8	3.7	2.1	100.0	381
Trust	14.0	27.5	36.4	17.4	4.7	100.0	385
Favoritism	4.5	19.6	54.4	14.9	6.6	100.0	377
Fairness in Assigning Work	11.9	24.0	46.4	13.7	4.0	100.0	379
Reaction to New Behavior or Dress	15.5	29.1	31.0	18.1	6.3	100.0	381
Hiring Practices	28.6	33.2	17.4	15.6	5.2	100.0	384
Promotion	15.1	34.3	35.3	12.0	3.3	100.0	391
Layoff Processes	10.4	17.2	51.8	15.4	5.2	100.0	383
Money for Training and Education	35.8	39.0	19.1	4.0	2.1	100.0	377

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

(Summary All Companies **)cont.

	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
Process Variable	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Community Relations	22.4	42.6	25.1	7.4	2.5	100.0	366
Setting Pay Rates	7.3	22.7	58.1	8.3	3.6	100.0	384
Red Tape	3.8	15.6	61.8	14.2	4.6	100.0	366
Grapevine	9.1	13.6	54.3	13.9	9.1	100.0	361

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

** The data shown in this summary table are taken from the total of tables in Appendix 3, Section I. Tables in other sections of Appendix 3 may differ slightly due to rounding procedures and variation in number of useable reports.

3.1

Perceived "Better" or "Worse"

gains far outweigh perceived losses. The interpersonal relations and work processes within the companies are perceived as changed for the better as a result of these programs. However, we also find some alienation of trust accompanied by feelings of favoritism and fairness.

3.2

Length of Service

From the tables in Appendix 3, we find that the responses of those with less tnan one year and those with over 15 years of service contrast with those having 6 - 10 years of service. While all three categories report gains in the patterns reported above, the 6 - 10 year group consistently reports slightly smaller gains in fifteen out of the twenty process variables studied.

In the ten areas roughly classifiable as interpersonal processes, eight out of the ten were perceived as better by a higher percentage of newcomers in contrast to the old timers. The two exceptions are concern for individual's welfare, and reaction to new behavior or dress. In brief, while newcomers see interpersonal conditions as better, they are not as sure of the company's concern for them.

The group with 6-10 years of service who report slightly higher losses (worse and much worse ratings), are the group of forgotten people. In one of the companies, there was a program to give special attention to training and promotion of old timers. But this middle group has not been singled out for attention although they have an opportunity to share in the company programs for all.

3.3

Racial and Cultural Background

More blacks tend to report gains than do the whites. In the twenty areas studied, there are higher percentages of blacks reporting gains than whites for all process variables but two. The two areas in which blacks are slightly below whites in gains perceived are: concern with individual welfare, and promotion. On many of the gains, the higher percentage of blacks is probably statistically significant. It is also true that more blacks are newcomers, who, as said above, tended to perceive more change.

The satisfaction of blacks with the changes and with the effects of these programs on organizational processes reinforces our observations and the tone of interviews, although in the interviews much more verbal dissatisfaction was expressed than seems to show in data from the questionnaire.

3.4

Managers and Hourly Workers

It is fairly clear that a greater percentage of hourly workers reported worse conditions than did managers although hourly workers were in line with the general pattern of seeing more "betters" than "worses" in each area. In general, managers do not report things as worse. It may be supposed that this is partially due to their sense of managerial responsibility which would not allow them to report "worses" because of the implied failure of their role.

The area of trust shows twenty-five percent of the managers, twenty-six percent of the foremen/supervisors, twenty percent of hourly, and eighteen percent of the professional staff reporting worse and much worse. Again, this seems to reflect perceptions of staff people, among whom are individuals in personnel and human relations with responsibility for maintaining trust levels within the companies. Again, it must be reiterated, the percentage of betters outweighs the percentage of worses in perceptions of trust although by a smaller margin than in other areas.

The fact that ten percent of respondents left some areas unmarked might shift the interpretations. Our impression is that the omissions represent a respondent's uncertainty on an area which he perceived as requiring a very complex judgement. The appropriately cautious statement for us would be that perceptions not expressed were not extreme and probably would not add significantly to the "better" or "worse" judgements.

3.5

Conservative Militant Reactions to Change

Appendix 5 presents the results of analyzing relations between conservatism or militancy and the various process variables studied. Conservatism or militancy were defined in terms of quantiative activity indices rather than implying a specific constellation of attitudes. Thus, "conservative", for purposes of our analysis, means that an individual's activity index is in the lower half of the indices when the are arranged in order of numerical size. "Militant" correspondingly means that a person's activity index falls in the upper half.

Both Cultural/Racial Backgrounds and the Level of Position were significantly related to a respondent's conservative-militant classification. Black respondents were significantly more militant than whites. As the level of position increased, the proportion of persons measured as militants increased.

Ten of the process variables studied showed that perception of change was significantly different for conservatives and militants. For each of these ten variables the percentage of militants who saw change as better was consistently larger than the percentage of conservatives who saw change as better.

3.5

Conservative Militant Reactions to Change

Consistently, the percentage of conservatives who saw change as worse was greater than the percentage of militants who saw change as worse. For example, in their perception of change for the process variable of communication 76 percent of the militants saw changes as better while only 55 percent of the conservatives agreed. For this same variable only three percent of the militants saw changes as worse but 14 percent of the conservatives judged change as worse.

APPENDICES

Questionnaire and Activity Scale Forms

The forms used to gather quantitative data included a two-page questionnaire and a one-page Activity Scale which measured respondents' attitudes toward direct social action by industry. (See Appendix 2 for a discussion of the Activity Scale and the Activity Index derived from it.) This appendix contains these forms.

The questionnaire identified each respondent by three dimensions: Years in Company, Cultural/Racial Background, and Level of Position. The purpose of question 2 was to identify a respondent's familiarity with the various programs carried on by each company for disadvantaged and minority persons. In questions 3 and 4 each respondent identified the amount of change her perceived as having occurred in the twenty process variables studied. He also indicated whether he judged the change he perceived as a benefit (better) or a cost (worse).

The process variables listed in question 3 were those expressing working and interpersonal relationships. Question 4 listed company wide organizational processes. Question 5 identified whether or not the respondent had been interviewed, and question 6 provided for additional comments. In general, respondents required 15 to 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire and Activity Scale.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY HUMAN RELATIONS CENTER
270 Bay State Road, Boston, Mass. 02215

July 14, 1970

This questionnaire is part of a Boston University study of how special activities carried on for minority groups have affected your organization. Your cooperation is very important in order to be sure that all viewpoints are represented so that accurate conclusions can be made.

All information will be kept in strict confidence so that no individual data is revealed. Please answer all questions.

1. Social data: Years in Company: Less than 1 year____; 1 to 5 years____; 6 to 10 years____; 11 to 15 years ____; Over 15 years____.

   Cultural /Racial Background: White____;Spanish speaking____; Black____; Oriental____; Other (Write in)________________________________.

   Level of Position: Hourly paid____; Foreman/supervisor __; Professional Staff____; Manager____; Other (Write in)________________.

2. So far as you know has or is your company carrying on any of the following activites for persons from minority groups in entry jobs (beginner, unskilled, etc.)? Check all programs company has or is conducting.

   _____special recruiting and hiring
   _____special counseling
   _____on-the-job training
   _____basic education (for example, courses in English and Arithmetic)
   _____supervisory programs
   _____no programs
   _____other programs (write in)_______________________.

3. Indicate your opinion of how much people in the company (other than people brought in by special programs for minorites) have changed in the way they relate to other people since the above programs have been conducted. For each of the items below circle the kind of change which you consider most accurately reflects what you think has happened.

Area	How Much Change (Circle one)				
Communication	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Teamwork	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Getting Along with People	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Productivity	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse

Judging Work	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Concern for individual's welfare	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Talking to higher management	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Personal achievement	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Trust	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Favoritism	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Fairness in assigning work	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Reaction to new behavior or dress	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse

4. Indicate how you think these programs have affected the company's processes and ways of handling situations. Circle your best judgement of the change in each case.

Situation	How Much Change (Circle One)				
Hiring Practices	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Promotion	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Layoff processes	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Money for Training & Education	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Community Relations	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Setting of pay rates	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Red Tape	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
Grapevine	Much Better	Somewhat Better	No Change	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse

5. In order to help us understand the data from the questionnaire, please indicate whether or not you have been personally interviewed by Boston University staff during this study Yes____No____

6. We will appreciate any additional comments you would like to make: Please use back of this page.

Thank you for your cooperation.

July 14, 1970

ACTIVITIES SCALE

Please rank (by numbering) the activities described below according to what you believe should be done during the present decade. Put #1 next to activity or special effort you think most appropriate, #2 the next most appropriate,etc. Please rank all seven activity descriptions.

#_____ Let everyone achieve their goals through hard work and study without starting any special programs in business for minority groups.

#_____ Don't have any special efforts in business but see that every child gets a good education in knowledge, skills and character so that when he goes to work he can compete with others on an equal basis.

#_____ Do as much as possible to let everyone know what jobs are available so that qualified people from minority groups can apply and be hired the same as everyone else.

#_____ Eliminate all laws and regulations which can be used to prevent hiring people from minority groups or to make it difficult for them to stay on their jobs.

#_____ Give special assistance so persons from minority groups can pass hiring requirements and get special counseling to help them keep their jobs.

#_____ See that there are people from minority groups in all levels, from workers to top management, even if we have to change procedures for selection and promotion.

#_____ Hire no one but people from minority groups for some time so that we can correct quickly the results of past discrimination against them.

The Activity Scale and Activity Index

This appendix describes the scale constructed to assess respondents' preferences for activity programs to increase minority group inclusion and participation in industry and business. In order to minimize surplus meaning and get a "cleaner" response, we called the scale an "Activity Scale."

First, we describe the development of the scale and our conceptual intentions. The second part describes a scoring index for individuals based on their response to the scale. Then we examine some of the quantitative properties of the scale as reflected by preferences. The last section describes some of the associations of Activity Scale data with background data of respondents which is evidence indicating validity of the scoring index.

I. Development of the Activity Scale

A. Purposes

Development of the Activity Scale has had several phases and versions. Our initial purpose in developing the scale was to get at what from one perspective could be called "racism" in employment and education. In trying to move toward a scale with properties of a single dimension along "action" or program lines, we have altered, through several versions, each item in order to obtain: (1) face validity, and (2) empirical validation for the idea that the scale should have dimensionality. We have noted that changing a word or two in certain items alters radically the rank or choice position of the item. Pretest of the items was accomplished with college students at Boston University and approximately fifty students in an all black college in Atlanta, Georgia. These preliminary data were used to adjust the items for sequence, that is "face dimensionality". No intensive quantitative analysis of pre-test data was undertaken.

The methodology originally conceived consisted of a procedure requiring comparison of items grouped by threes with the respondent indicating which item of the triad he agreed with most and which he agreed with least. A large number of triad combinations was required in order to obtain comparisons of each item with all the other items.

This "forced choice" procedure met with no resistance when used with college students, but a field test with the enlarged planning committee of persons from business companies evoked much dissatisfaction. Among other things, representatives of the employees believed the repetition of items in different contexts would be seen by the respondent as an attempt to trap him. Arousing this feeling of entrapment would generate suspicion of the project and questioning of the sincerity of explicitly stated objectives. We agreed that such a reaction would be serious both with respect to obtaining data and confidence in the accuracy of data obtained. The compromise finally agreed upon lost many advantages by asking respondents only to rank the seven items in order of preference.

The actual wording of the instructions was as follows:

> "Please rank (by numbering) the activities described below according to what you believe should be done during the present decade. Put #1 next to activity or special effort you think most appropriate, #2 the next most appropriate, etc.. Please rank all seven activity descriptions."

The number of respondents varies among different tabulations of the data from 402 to 330. The latter figure represents tabulations of data for only questionnaires which had complete data on all questions as well as the Activity Scale. The summary figures reported below are based on tabulations using data from 330 respondents.

The seven items or statements of the Activity Scale are expressed in terms of action alternatives for ways to increase the number of people from minorities in business organizations. We felt that a way to catch hold of "institutional racism" was to present various action strategies with a "positive tone or value" and in as concrete action terms as possible. Presenting action alternatives poses questions for choice more realistically than choice among sets of attitudinal components and dimensions in racism. At the same time, however, our approach may have blurred irretrievably the concept of "racism".

Another way of viewing the scale dimension along an action continuum is to see the attitudes reflected by the items as ranging from arch-conservative to most active militant.

B. The Items

1. The first item of the activity scale, referred to as item A, is:

> "Let everyone achieve their goals through hard work and study without starting any special programs in business for minority groups."

A summary phrase for item A is "Hard Work." We might note that it was necessary to add the negative or exclusion issue so that item A would not receive universal assent. This item expresses the point of view often labeled "the American Way", or the "way we made it."

In the total scale, item A is the anchor for the conservative view towards change and action to increase minority employment. The implicit statement here is that the responsibility rests entirely on the minority group member to "make it", and there exists no major or unreasonably large barriers that cannot be overcome by individual effort.

It is interesting to note that ten percent of the respondents selected item A as their first preference when all seven items were ranked. Thus, we were successful in obtaining expression from individuals with views at variance to those current in action programs for hiring minorities.

2. The second item on the activity scale, labeled item B for the sake of analysis, is:

> "Don't have any special efforts in business but see that every child gets a good education in knowledge, skills and character so that when he goes to work he can compete with others on an equal basis."

A short phrase for this item is "Early Education." Again, as in item A, the negative statement of "no special efforts in business" was required.

The intent of item B is to catch the view that what is needed is to give everyone a fair chance in entering the starting gates in the race. This metaphor was developed by high officials of the United States Government in their justification of programs of early education.

From the viewpoint of scale construction, item B caused much difficulty. In the pretest, instead of occupying a reasonably fixed position in respondents' choices, rankings of item B showed no consistent pattern but were spread all over. Students of psychology, the pretest respondents, thought item B was the key item, despite their expressed proclivity for action. With the explicit exclusion of action programs in business, and explicitly specifying equality in competition, item B seems to fall in place ordinally. As in item A, item B implicitly rules out action for the present generation in favor of emphasis on action for the future generation.

Item B was the first preference of 17.1 percent of respondents. Thus, 27 percent of the total group in this study picked either item A or item B as their first choice.

3. The label for item C, the third item, is "Distribute Job Information". Letting minority persons know of job availability represents some affirmative action. It assumes the usual channels of communicating job availability bypass certain groups of individuals or that a policy of making job opportunities known indicates positive desire to hire qualified minority individuals. The exact wording of item C is:

> "Do as much as possible to let everyone know what jobs are available so that qualified people from minority groups can apply and be hired the same as everyone else."

We found that the word "qualified" plus the phrase "the same as everyone else" enabled respondents to distinguish the position of this item from other positions. The aspect of racism implicit in item C is that opportunity has been denied minority people by keeping them from having the same information on job availability thus denying them the opportunity to apply for the same jobs as everyone else. As in items A and B, there is no substantive program for minority persons; the issue is one of recruiting in such a way as to give everyone an equal chance to apply. Item C represents a position of fairness through equal access to information and does not point to any more affirmative actions.

Twenty-two percent of the group picked item C as their first preference. Since items A, B and C are not mutually exclusive, it is reasonable to expect that most persons would place item C as one of their first four choices. In fact, roughly ninety-five percent of respondents did place item C within their first four preference ratings.

4. The fourth item (D) is:

> "Eliminate all laws and regulations which can be used to prevent hiring people from minority groups or to make it difficult for them to stay on their jobs."

The short phrase reflective of this position is "Remove Discriminatory Barriers." The attack on discrimination during the period immediately following World War II concentrated on the position that laws and regulations were being used by companies to prevent hiring or retaining persons of the minority. Action based on this position is directed to searching out and eliminating ways in which race, religion or national origins (with sex and age added later) were associated with laws and regulations which prevent hiring and retaining people in these categories.

Use of the word "regulations" was intended to get at institutionalized procedures bolstered by sanctions which operate in hiring and retaining. There was a difficult decision for construction of position D in trying to evoke the concept of "which can be used" as contrasted to the concept expressed in "are used".

Interpreting position D in another way, the broad conception of institutional racism is read into this position. The wording for the fuller impact of institutional racism might be "which have the effect of preventing hiring..." These extensions of meaning in interpreting position D cannot be entirely avoided. Indeed, each item has a range of extension or band of meaning due to interpretation.

Twenty-three percent of respondents picked item D as their first preference; only twenty-three percent did not pick item D as one of their first four preferences.

5. The fifth item (E) may be labeled as "Special Programs". In some ways this item reflects current policies and practices of government and business in actively encouraging employment of minorities, especially those programs related to persons of the "hard-core" and"disadvantaged". Government sponsored programs have paid special attention to the necessity for providing training in job skills, basic skills in communication, basic education and so forth along with job counsellors and additional backup services.

The wording of item E is:

> "Give special assistance so persons from minority groups can pass hiring requirements and get special counseling to help them keep their jobs."

In wording item E we hesitated among "pass hiring requirements", to "Pass equivalents for hiring requirements", or indicating some temporary waivers of hiring requirements. During pre-testing and in talking with persons actively working in this area, there developed a definite set of reasons for using the phrase "pass hiring requirements". Our impression is that the direct confrontation and challenge to "standards" of hiring requirements would be very difficult for persons to accept overtly. Covert and informal behavior may differ from official behavior, but we found no strong views about confronting the legitimacy of hiring requirements.

The twin issues of hiring and retaining are reflected in item E. With a set of scale alternatives which was extended or stretched out compared with the range of this scale, we would differentiate these separate steps. More people seem willing to help others acquire skills necessary to pass hiring requirements than are willing to add special programs which help others retain their jobs. It was our impression during pretest that persons most familiar with programming for employment of the disadvantaged preferred to put these two aspects, acquiring basic skills for hiring and support in job retention, together with one program.

Given the fact that each of the companies in the group who answered the questionnaire had special programs, still only nineteen percent of respondents preferred this approach as their first alternative of "activity or special effort you think most appropriate during the present decade."

6. The sixth item (F) may be labeled in brief as "Equal Representation." In some sense, it is logically not in sequence with adjacent items (E and G).

Item F is worded as follows:

> "See that there are people from minority groups in all levels, from workers to top management, even if we have to change procedures for selection and promotion."

Item F was included to extend the upper (militant) end of the scale in order to represent positions currently expressed. Proponents of this position predict that hiring minority persons will perpetuate and accentuate retention and promotion issues unless there are role models of minority success at most echelons of the company. Creation of strata and layers above which one finds no minority persons will, they argue, create conditions operating to discourage hiring minority personnel.

Inclusion of the phrase "even if we have to change procedures for selection and promotion" forced item F out of the universally acceptable format with which all respondents could agree. The wording "even if we have to change procedures for selection and promotion" posed difficulties in interpretation. On the one hand, people read in the sense of "as more relevant" which others read in "without regard to standards and competencies." In future studies separation is needed to clarify these interpretations.

Eight percent of the total number of respondents picked item F as their first preference. Forty-one percent picked this as their sixth or seventh preference.

7. The last item in the scale (G) provided an extreme anchor point for respondents who want more decisive action much more quickly in hiring minority persons. A short phrase to capture the spirit of this item is "Reverse Quota".

Item G is worded as follows:

> "Hire no one but people from minority groups for some time so that we can correct quickly the results of past discrimination against them."

We had difficulty in trying to specify the implied numbers of such a reverse quota, and finally decided to push the statement to its extreme by saying "Hire no one but people from minority groups...". In field tests, we found that people who wanted more than a "token quota" were concerned for the notion rather than the exact proportion. For some, establishing an exact number or proportion in quota hiring was not as important as the idea of "catching up" in some foreseeable period of time. For these people, the commitment was to the value of catching up through overhiring. There was also the value, for them, of rectifying a social injustice, which at the same time raised the question of fairness or justice for persons not of the minority.

Only one percent of respondents picked item G as their first choice and only six percent were willing to give second, third or fourth position preferences to this item. Two-thirds of the people put this item as the very last choice.

II. Respondent Index Based on Activity Scale

Since the items on the Activity Scale represent different social positions ranging from arch conservative (Item A) to active militant (Item G), it was decided to derive a method using Activity Scale responses which would quantitatively express each respondent's position on the arch conservative-active militant continuum. In other words, combine each respondent's activity response pattern into an activity index that in some way summarized each respondent's social stance.

We used the following method: A matrix was set up with the activity items (A, B, C, D, E, F, G) forming one dimension, and the rank choices (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) possible for each item being the other dimension (see Chart I). The body of the matrix consists of the weights to be associated with rank choice for each item. The final index is the sum of the respondent's rank choice for each item as weighted by its position within the matrix.

The weights within the matrix are position weights. The arrangement of items in the Activity Scale represents the arch conservative position. Therefore, a respondent who ranked the items in the same order as given on the Activity Scale should receive an index of zero. This consideration fixes the diagonal of weights in the matrix from upper left to lower right as zeros reflecting the original ranking of activity items as ordered on the page.

The other weights are essentially measures of the distance the respondent's ranking shifted a particular activity item from its original position as given on the Activity Scale. This shift is measured in arithmetic not algebraic terms. In other words, the number of places shifted is counted but this method does not take into account the direction of the shift. From the viewpoint of logic there is an appeal to taking account of direction of shift as well as amount of shift. The mathematical result, however, is to decrease the number of quantitative categories (indices) and thus, decrease in range of the index increases the confounding of patterns within categories.

Constructing the index from the amount of shift from original position while it omits some logical refinement does give an expanded scale allowing clearer categorization. Another advantage is that the simplicity of the method gives a more intuitive grasp of the result than a more complex method. It was also found that comparing results using other methods gave a correlation index of +0.94 so that the sophistication that might be gained by a taking account of direction of shift did not appear significant when weighed against the ability to understand and use the activity index.

Below are given the matrix used and illustrations of its use.

Chart I: Weights For Scores Assigned to Rank Order Preferences

		Ranking by Respondent						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Activity Scale Items	A	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	B	1	0	1	2	3	4	5
	C	2	1	0	1	2	3	4
	D	3	2	1	0	1	2	3
	E	4	3	2	1	0	1	2
	F	5	4	3	2	1	0	1
	G	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Examples of Use: (R = Rank, W = Weight)

	#1		Score	#2		Score	#3		Score
Item	Rank	Weight	RxW	Rank	Weight	RxW	Rank	Weight	RxW
A	1	0	0	2	1	2	4	3	12
B	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
C	3	0	0	4	1	4	2	1	2
D	4	0	0	3	1	3	5	1	5
E	5	0	0	5	0	0	6	1	6
F	6	0	0	6	0	0	3	3	9
G	7	0	0	7	0	0	7	0	0
Index (Sum)			0			10			35

Examples of Use

	#4			#5			#6			#7			#8		
Item	R	W	RxW	R	W	RxW	R	W	RxW	R	W	RxW	R	W	RxW
A	5	4	20	6	5	30	7	6	42	7	6	42	7	6	42
B	3	1	3	5	3	15	6	4	24	6	4	24	6	4	24
C	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	5	2	10	5	2	10
D	4	0	0	3	1	3	1	3	3	4	0	0	2	2	4
E	1	4	4	1	4	4	3	2	6	3	2	6	1	4	4
F	7	1	7	4	2	8	5	1	5	2	4	8	3	3	9
G	6	1	6	7	0	0	4	3	12	1	6	6	4	3	12
Index(Sum)			42			62			94			96			105

Examples 7 and 8 are worth noting. Example 7 reverses the original rank order of items as given in the scale resulting in an index of 96. Logically, this would seem to result in the highest (most militant) index. In fact, it does not as shown by example 8 where rearrangement of the last four items (D, E, F, G) results in an index of 105, the highest index revealed.

III. Tabulations of Activity Scale Data

In Table I the overall percentages for each item and rank position are given. The items are not operating in a smooth curve, nor is each item conforming to a single mode distribution. By inspection, it would appear that flatness of distribution is more apparent than any other shape.

Table I: Percentage Distribution of Rank Order Preferences Assigned Seven Items of Activity Scale N = 326

Item	Specification	Rank						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A	Hard Work	10.1	9.5	9.5	11.9	18.0	22.9	18.0
B	Early Education	17.1	15.3	13.1	20.8	19.6	9.8	4.3
C	Distribute Job Information	21.7	25.7	29.7	15.9	5.5	15.0	0.0
D	Eliminate Discrimination	22.6	21.4	14.4	19.0	10.1	6.1	6.4
E	Special Program	19.0	21.1	23.5	13.5	16.8	5.2	0.9
F	Equal Representation	8.3	6.1	8.9	15.6	20.5	37.0	3.7
G	Reverse Quota	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.7	9.2	16.8	66.7

Table II: Rankings of Individual Activity Scale Items by Companies, Frequency Distribution

Item A - Hard Work

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	92	8	8	12	8	21	23	12
Y	234	24	23	19	31	38	52	47
All	326	32	31	31	39	59	75	59

Item B - Early Education

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	92	12	14	16	26	14	4	6
Y	234	44	35	27	42	50	28	8
All	326	56	49	43	68	64	32	14

Item C - Distribute Job Information

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	92	30	23	16	16	5	2	0
Y	234	41	61	80	36	13	3	0
All	326	71	84	96	52	18	5	0

Item D - Eliminate Discrimination

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	92	25	26	8	13	5	10	5
Y	234	49	44	39	48	28	10	16
All	326	74	70	47	61	33	20	21

Item E - Special Programs

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	92	11	15	32	15	16	2	1
Y	234	51	54	45	29	38	15	2
All	326	62	69	77	44	54	17	3

Table II: Rankings of Individual Activity Scale Items by Companies, Frequency Distribution

Item F - Equal Representation

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	92	5	6	9	14	18	38	2
Y	234	22	14	20	37	49	82	10
All	326	27	20	29	51	67	120	12

Item G - Reverse Quota

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	92	1	0	0	2	12	11	66
Y	234	3	4	4	10	18	44	151
All	326	4	4	4	12	30	55	217

Table III: Rankings of Individual Activity Scale Items by Companies, Percentage Distribution

Item A - Hard Work

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	100.0	8.7	8.7	13.0	8.7	22.8	25.0	13.0
Y	100.0	10.3	9.8	8.1	13.2	16.2	22.2	20.1
All	100.0	10.1	9.5	9.5	11.9	18.0	22.9	18.0

Item B - Early Education

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	100.0	13.0	15.2	17.4	28.3	15.2	4.3	6.5
Y	100.0	18.8	15.0	11.5	17.9	21.4	12.0	3.4
All	100.0	17.1	15.3	13.1	20.8	19.6	9.8	4.3

Item C - Distribute Job Information

		Rank						
Company	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	100.0	32.6	25.0	17.4	17.4	5.4	2.2	0.0
Y	100.0	17.5	26.1	34.2	15.4	5.6	1.3	0.0
All	100.0	21.7	25.7	29.7	15.9	5.5	1.5	0.0

Table III: Rankings of Individual Activity Scale Items by Companies, Percentage Distribution

Item D - Eliminate Discrimination

Company	Total	Rank						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	100.0	27.2	28.3	8.7	14.1	5.4	10.9	5.4
Y	100.0	20.9	18.8	16.7	20.5	12.0	4.3	6.8
All	100.0	22.6	21.4	14.4	19.0	10.1	6.1	6.4

Item E - Special Programs

Company	Total	Rank						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	100.0	12.0	16.3	34.8	16.3	17.4	2.2	1.1
Y	100.0	21.8	23.1	19.2	12.4	16.2	6.4	0.9
All	100.0	19.0	21.1	23.5	13.5	16.8	5.2	0.9

Item F - Equal Representation

Company	Total	Rank						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	100.0	5.4	6.5	9.8	15.2	19.6	41.3	2.2
Y	100.0	9.4	6.0	8.5	15.8	20.9	35.0	4.3
All	100.0	8.3	6.1	8.9	15.6	20.5	37.0	3.7

Item G - Reverse Quota

Company	Total	Rank						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X	100.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.2	13.0	12.0	71.7
Y	100.0	1.3	1.7	1.7	4.3	7.7	18.8	64.5
All	100.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.7	9.2	16.8	66.7

Tabulations of Selected Questionnaire Data

The questionnaire data that was collected by answers to questions 3 and 4, measured the amount and direction of change (Much Better, Better, No Change, Worse, or Much Worse) as this was perceived in twenty different areas of either organizational processes or interpersonal relationships between employees. These twenty process variables were: Communication, Teamwork, Getting Along with People, Productivity, Judging Work, Concern for Individual's Welfare, Talking to Higher Management, Personal Achievement, Trust, Favoritism, Fairness in Assigning Work, Reaction to New Behavior or Dress, Hiring Practices, Promotion, Layoff Process, Money for Training and Education, Community Relations, Setting Pay Rates, Red Tape, and Grapevine.

The amount of change perceived by an individual for each of these twenty variables was then related to 1) his years of service in the company, 2) his cultural/racial background and, 3) his level of position in the company. (Question 1 of the questionnaire).

Tables in Section I show the percentage distribution of answers indicating the amount and direction of change perceived for each of the twenty variables in relation to the respondent's years of service in the company. The total number of respondents on which the percentages are based are also shown. Tables in Part A combine data from both companies. Tables in Part B use data of Company X while tables in Part C show data of Company Y.

Tables in Section II, also percentage distributions, relate the amount and direction of change perceived for each of the twenty variables to the cultural/racial background of the respondents. Again, Part A includes data of both companies, Part B Company X, and Part C Company Y.

Section III tables show the percentage distribution of answers indicating the amount and direction of change perceived in relation to the level of position held by the respondents. As in Sections I and II, Part A includes both companies, Part B only Company X, and Part C only Company Y.

N, the actual number of observations in each category on which the percentages were based is shown.

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Arrangement of Tables

Section I: Indicated change in relations to years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined
Part B: Company X
Part C: Company Y

Section II: Indicated change in relation to cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined
Part B: Company X
Part C: Company Y

Section III: Indicated change in relation to level of position

Part A: Companies combined
Part B: Company X
Part C: Company Y

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Communication

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	25.0	43.8	31.2	----	----	100.0	32
1 - 5	21.5	46.6	24.6	5.2	2.1	100.0	191
6 - 10	13.5	48.6	25.7	10.8	1.4	100.0	74
11 - 15	13.6	44.0	28.8	11.9	1.7	100.0	59
Over 15	26.2	35.7	26.2	11.9	----	100.0	42
Total	19.6	45.3	26.1	7.5	1.5	100.0	398

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Teamwork

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	24.2	42.5	21.2	9.1	3.0	100.0	33
1 - 5	13.0	40.0	37.3	6.5	3.2	100.0	185
6 - 10	15.1	31.5	42.5	8.2	2.7	100.0	73
11 - 15	10.2	33.9	40.6	13.6	1.7	100.0	59
Over 15	14.3	40.5	33.3	11.9	----	100.0	42
Total	14.0	37.7	37.0	8.7	2.6	100.0	392

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	34.4	31.2	21.9	12.5	----	100.0	32
1 - 5	22.1	44.7	23.7	7.4	2.1	100.0	190
6 - 10	12.3	45.2	31.5	11.0	----	100.0	73
11 - 15	15.3	39.0	32.1	11.9	1.7	100.0	59
Over 15	23.8	40.5	28.6	7.1	----	100.0	42
Total	20.5	42.3	26.8	9.1	1.3	100.0	396

N* = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Productivity

Years In Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	12.5	53.1	18.8	15.6	----	100.0	32
1 - 5	13.5	28.1	43.8	11.4	3.2	100.0	185
6 - 10	8.3	20.8	47.3	15.3	8.3	100.0	72
11-- 15	3.4	31.0	46.7	17.2	1.7	100.0	58
Over 15	19.5	31.7	41.5	7.3	----	100.0	41
Total	11.6	29.6	42.5	12.9	3.4	100.0	388

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A; Companies combined

Process Variable: Judging Work

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	12.1	48.5	36.4	3.0	----	100.0	33
1 - 5	16.9	27.9	45.9	6.4	2.9	100.0	172
6 - 10	9.9	23.9	47.9	15.5	2.8	100.0	71
11 - 15	3.9	37.3	52.9	3.9	2.0	100.0	51
Over 15	12.5	35.0	47.5	5.0	----	100.0	40
Total	12.8	31.1	46.5	7.4	2.2	100.0	367

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	9.7	35.5	48.3	6.5	----	100.0	31
1 - 5	26.7	38.0	23.0	7.0	5.3	100.0	187
6 - 10	16.4	31.5	35.7	12.3	4.1	100.0	73
11 - 15	17.5	42.1	28.1	10.5	1.8	100.0	57
Over 15	36.6	26.8	31.7	4.9	----	100.0	41
Total	23.1	36.1	29.0	8.2	3.6	100.0	389

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	*N
Less than 1	50.0	18.8	28.1	----	3.1	100.0	32
1 - 5	25.7	35.8	32.6	4.3	1.6	100.0	187
6 - 10	22.2	36.1	34.7	5.6	1.4	100.0	72
11 - 15	20.3	42.4	32.2	3.4	1.7	100.0	59
Over 15	25.0	37.5	35.0	2.5	----	100.0	40
Total	26.2	35.7	32.8	3.8	1.5	100.0	390

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	*N
Less than 1	23.3	36.7	40.0	----	----	100.0	30
1 - 5	19.1	40.4	32.8	4.4	3.3	100.0	183
6 - 10	18.3	22.5	53.6	4.2	1.4	100.0	71
11 - 15	14.0	42.1	36.8	5.3	1.8	100.0	57
Over 15	25.0	32.5	42.5	----	----	100,0	40
Total	19.2	36.2	38.8	3.7	2.1	100.0	381

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Trust

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	29.0	25.8	32.3	9.7	3.2	100.0	31
1 - 5	12.6	29.5	36.6	15.8	5.5	100.0	183
6 - 10	8.5	26.8	36.6	22.5	5.6	100.0	71
11 - 15	13.6	23.7	35.6	23.7	3.4	100.0	59
Over 15	19.5	26.8	39.1	12.2	2.4	100.0	41
Total	14.0	27.5	36.4	17.4	4.7	100.0	385

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Favoritism

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	6.5	29.0	51.6	12.9	----	100.0	31
1 - 5	3.8	19.8	54.5	13.7	8.2	100.0	182
6 - 10	2.8	18.3	47.9	18.3	12.7	100.0	71
11 - 15	1.9	20.8	52.8	24.5	----	100.0	53
Over 15	12.5	12.5	70.0	2.5	2.5	100.0	40
Total	4.5	19.6	54.4	14.9	6.6	100.0	377

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	26.7	23.3	30.0	16.7	3.3	100.0	30
1 - 5	10.6	25.6	45.5	13.3	5.0	100.0	180
6 - 10	8.5	22.5	42.3	21.1	5.6	100.0	71
11 - 15	10.5	19.3	57.9	10.5	1.8	100.0	57
Over 15	14.6	26.8	53.7	4.9	----	100.0	41
Total	11.9	24.0	46.4	13.7	4.0	100.0	379

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior/Dress

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	20.0	16.7	40.0	13.3	10.0	100.0	30
1 - 5	12.7	32.6	37.0	14.4	3.3	100.0	181
6 - 10	11.0	32.9	21.9	26.0	8.2	100.0	73
11 - 15	19.3	22.8	26.3	22.8	8.8	100.0	57
Over 15	27.5	25.0	20.0	17.5	10.0	100.0	40
Total	15.5	29.1	31.0	18.1	6.3	100.0	381

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	34.4	34.4	25.0	----	6.2	100.0	32
1 - 5	31.5	32.6	16.6	13.8	5.5	100.0	181
6 - 10	19.2	37.0	13.7	20.5	9.6	100.0	73
11 - 15	25.0	30.4	19.6	23.2	1.8	100.0	56
Over 15	33.3	31.0	19.0	16.7	----	100.0	42
Total	28.6	33.2	17.4	15.6	5.2	100.0	384

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Promotion

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	18.8	37.5	37.5	3.1	3.1	100.0	32
1 - 5	16.0	32.6	35.4	10.7	5.3	100.0	187
6 - 10	12.3	30.1	31.6	23.3	2.7	100.0	73
11 - 15	13.6	35.6	40.6	10.2	----	100,0	59
Over 15	15.0	45.0	32.5	7.5	----	100.0	40
Total	15.1	34.3	35.3	12.0	3.3	100.0	391

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	6.5	16.1	41.9	25.8	9.7	100.0	31
1 - 5	11.5	18.1	48.4	15.4	6.6	100.0	182
6 - 10	8.5	12.7	56.3	18.3	4.2	100.0	71
11 - 15	11.9	16.9	54.2	13.6	3.4	100.0	59
Over 15	10.0	22.5	62.5	5.0	----	100.0	40
Total	10.4	17.2	51.8	15.4	5.2	100.0	383

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	26.7	40.0	23.3	6.7	3.3	100,0	30
1 - 5	40.2	35.2	17.3	4.5	2.8	100.0	179
6 - 10	31.0	45.1	18.3	2.8	2.8	100.0	71
11 - 15	27.6	46.5	20.7	5.2	----	100.0	58
Over 15	43.6	33.3	23.1	-----	-----	100.0	39
Total	35.8	39.0	19.1	4.0	2.1	100.0	377

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Community Relations

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	20.7	51.8	17.2	6.9	3.4	100.0	29
1 - 5	22.4	43.7	27.0	4.6	2.3	100.0	174
6 - 10	17.6	45.6	25.0	10.3	1.5	100.0	68
11 - 15	18.5	33.3	31.5	13.0	3.7	100.0	54
Over 15	36.6	39.1	14.6	7.3	2.4	100.0	41
Total	22.4	42.6	25.1	7.4	2.5	100.0	366

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	9.7	16.1	58.0	9.7	6.5	100.0	31
1 - 5	7.7	21.3	57.9	8.7	4.4	100.0	183
6 - 10	5.6	23.9	59.3	8.4	2.8	100.0	71
11 - 15	3.4	25.9	57.0	10.3	3.4	100.0	58
Over 15	12.2	26.8	58.6	2.4	----	100.0	41
Total	7.3	22.7	58.1	8.3	3.6	100.0	384

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Red Tape

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	3.4	20.7	37.9	20.7	17.3	100.0	29
1 - 5	3.4	12.7	67.9	10.3	5.7	100.0	174
6 - 10	2.9	11.8	61.7	22.1	1.5	100.0	68
11 - 15	3.6	21.4	55.3	17.9	1.8	100.0	56
Over 15	7.7	23.1	61.5	7.7	----	100.0	39
Total	3.8	15.6	61.8	14.2	4.6	100.0	366

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Grapevine

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	10.3	10.3	44.9	13.8	20.7	100.0	29
1 - 5	6.4	11.7	56.3	16.3	9.3	100.0	172
6 - 10	6.0	13.4	53.7	17.9	9.0	100.0	67
11 - 15	13.0	18.5	53.7	7.4	7.4	100.0	54
Over 15	20.5	17.9	53.9	5.1	2.6	100.0	39
Total	9.1	13.6	54.3	13.9	9.1	100.0	361

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Communication

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	20.0	48.0	32.0	----	----	100.0	25
1 - 5	36.9	43.1	13.8	6.2	----	100.0	65
6 - 10	25.0	55.0	15.0	5.0	----	100.0	20
11 - 15	22.2	22.2	44.5	11.1	----	100.0	9
Over 15	46.1	15.4	15.4	23.1	----	100.0	13
Total	31.8	41.7	19.7	6.8	----	100.0	132

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Teamwork

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	26.9	42.2	19.2	7.7	3.8	100.0	26
1 - 5	19.0	42.9	31.7	4.8	1.6	100.0	63
6 - 10	36.8	15.8	31.6	10.5	5.3	100.0	19
11 - 15	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.3	----	100.0	9
Over 15	23.1	30.7	23.1	23.1	----	100.0	13
Total	23.1	36.9	28.5	9.2	2.3	100.0	130

* N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	36.0	36.0	20.0	8.0	----	100.0	25
1 - 5	38.5	47.7	10.8	1.5	1.5	100.0	65
6 - 10	26.3	57.9	15.8	----	----	100.0	19
11 - 15	22.3	33.3	33.3	11.1	----	100.0	9
Over 15	46.2	15.4	30.7	7.7	----	100.0	13
Total	35.9	42.7	16.8	3.8	0.8	100.0	131

* N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Productivity

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	8.0	60.0	12.0	20.0	----	100.0	25
1 - 5	18.0	34.5	41.0	4.9	1.6	100.0	61
6 - 10	21.1	26.3	36.8	10.5	5.3	100.0	19
11 - 15	11.1	----	33.3	55.6	----	100.0	9
Over 15	25.0	25.0	41.7	8.3	----	100.0	12
Total	16.7	34.9	34.1	12.7	1.6	100.0	126

* N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Judging Work

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	11.5	53.9	34.6	----	----	100.0	26
1 - 5	25.4	32.2	37.3	5.1	----	100.0	59
6 - 10	22.2	33.3	27.8	16.7	----	100.0	18
11 - 15	14.3	28.6	42.8	14.3	----	100.0	7
Over 15	27.3	27.3	36.3	9.1	----	100.0	11
Total	21.5	36.4	35.5	6.6	----	100.0	121

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	8.3	29.2	58.3	4.2	----	100.0	24
1 - 5	41.9	32.4	17.7	3.2	4.8	100.0	62
6 - 10	21.1	36.8	42.1	----	----	100.0	19
11 - 15	11.1	22.2	55.6	11.1	----	100.0	9
Over 15	33.3	16.7	50.0	----	----	100.0	12
Total	29.4	30.2	34.8	3.2	2.4	100.0	126

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	56.0	12.0	32.0	----	----	100.0	25
1 - 5	30.6	35.6	30.6	1.6	1.6	100.0	62
6 - 10	38.9	33.3	22.2	5.6	----	100.0	18
11 - 15	11.1	33.3	55.6	----	----	100.0	9
Over 15	25.0	41.7	33.3	----	----	100.0	12
Total	34.9	31.0	31.7	1.6	0.8	100.0	126

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	21.7	34.8	43.5	----	----	100.0	23
1 - 5	33.3	33.3	28.4	3.3	1.7	100.0	60
6 - 10	30.0	30.0	40.0	----	----	100.0	20
11 - 15	----	55.6	44.4	----	----	100.0	9
Over 15	50.0	25.0	25.0	----	----	100.0	12
Total	29.8	33.9	33.9	1.6	0.8	100.0	124

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Trust

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	29.2	20.8	37.5	12.5	----	100.0	24
1 - 5	21.7	35.0	35.0	5.0	3.3	100.0	60
6 - 10	16.7	50.0	33.3	----	----	100.0	18
11 - 15	22.2	22.2	33.4	22.2	----	100.0	9
Over 15	25.1	33.3	33.3	8.3	----	100.0	12
Total	22.8	33.3	35.0	7.3	1.6	100.0	123

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Favoritism

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	8.0	24.0	56.0	12.0	----	100.0	25
1 - 5	3.4	28.8	50.8	8.5	8.5	100.0	59
6 - 10	5.6	33.3	38.8	16.7	5.6	100.0	18
11 - 15	----	----	83.3	16.7	----	100.0	6
Over 15	18.2	27.3	54.5	----	----	100.0	11
Total	5.9	26.9	52.1	10.1	5.0	100.0	119

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	32.0	20.0	24.0	20.0	4.0	100.0	25
1 - 5	11.7	30.0	45.0	8.3	5.0	100.0	60
6 - 10	22.2	38.9	27.8	11.1	----	100.0	18
11 - 15	22.2	22.2	55.6	----	----	100.0	9
Over 15	38.5	15.4	38.4	7.7	----	100.0	13
Total	20.8	27.2	38.4	10.4	3.2	100.0	125

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior/Dress

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	16.7	16.7	45.8	12.5	8.3	100.0	24
1 - 5	15.8	33.3	35.1	14.0	1.8	100.0	57
6 - 10	15.8	31.6	36.8	15.8	----	100.0	19
11 - 15	12.5	12.5	37.5	12.5	25.0	100.0	8
Over 15	25.0	33.4	8.3	25.0	8.3	100.0	12
Total	16.7	28.3	35.0	15.0	5.0	100.0	120

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	36.0	28.0	28.0	----	8.0	100.0	25
1 - 5	34.4	36.1	24.6	3.3	1.6	100.0	61
6 - 10	21.1	36.7	31.6	5.3	5.3	100.0	19
11 - 15	11.1	22.2	22.2	44.5	----	100.0	9
Over 15	38.5	38.5	23.0	----	----	100.0	13
Total	31.5	33.9	26.0	5.5	3.1	100.0	127

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Promotion

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	16.0	40.0	36.0	4.0	4.0	100.0	25
1 - 5	28.6	31.7	28.6	6.3	4.8	100.0	63
6 - 10	26.3	26.3	36.9	10.5	----	100.0	19
11 - 15	22.2	33.3	44.5	----	----	100.0	9
Total	25.0	35.2	31.2	5.5	3.1	100.0	128

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	4.2	8.3	45.8	29.2	12.5	100.0	24
1 - 5	6.7	20.0	46.6	21.7	5.0	100.0	60
6 - 10	16.7	5.6	72.1	5.6	----	100,0	18
11 - 15	11.1	----	77.8	----	11.1	100.0	9
Over 15	27.3	18.2	54.5	----	----	100.0	11
Total	9.8	13.9	53.4	17.2	5.7	100.0	122

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	20.8	37.5	29.2	8.3	4.2	100.0	24
1 - 5	54.4	26.3	7.0	7.0	5.3	100.0	57
6 - 10	41.2	35.3	17.6	5.9	----	100.0	17
11 - 15	33.3	44.5	11.1	11.1	----	100.0	9
Over 15	69.2	23.1	7.7	----	----	100.0	13
Total	45.9	30.8	13.3	6.7	3.3	100.0	120

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Community Relations

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	13.0	56.6	17.4	8.7	4.3	100.0	23
1 - 5	27.3	34.5	30.9	5.5	1.8	100.0	55
6 - 10	11.8	58.8	29.4	----	----	100.0	17
11 - 15	12.5	37.5	37.5	----	12.5	100.0	8
Over 15	33.3	41.7	25.0	----	----	100.0	12
Total	21.7	43.6	27.8	4.3	2.6	100.0	115

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	8.0	16.0	60.0	8.0	8.0	100.0	25
1 - 5	14.0	19.3	45.7	14.0	7.0	100.0	57
6 - 10	5.9	35.3	58.8	----	----	100.0	17
11 - 15	----	22.2	44.5	22.2	11.1	100.0	9
Over 15	7.7	38.4	46.2	7.7	----	100.0	13
Total	9.9	23.1	50.5	10.7	5.8	100.0	121

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Red Tape

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	----	17.4	39.2	21.7	21.7	100.0	23
1 - 5	9.1	14.5	63.6	7.3	5.5	100.0	55
6 - 10	6.7	----	80.0	13.3	----	100.0	15
11 - 15	12.5	12.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	100.0	8
Over 15	18.2	27.3	45.4	9.1	----	100.0	11
Total	8.0	14.3	57.2	12.5	8.0	100.0	112

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Grapevine

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	4.2	12.5	45.8	12.5	25.0	100.0	24
1 - 5	7.5	15.1	54.8	13.2	9.4	100.0	53
6 - 10	6.7	6.7	80.0	6.6	----	100.0	15
11 - 15	----	12.5	37.5	12.5	37.5	100.0	8
Over 15	10.0	40.0	40.0	10.0	----	100.0	10
Total	6.4	15.5	53.6	11.8	12.7	100.0	110

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Communication

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	42.8	28.6	28.6	----	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	13.5	48.3	30.2	4.8	3.2	100.0	126
6 - 10	9.3	46.2	29.6	13.0	1.9	100.0	54
11 - 15	12.0	48.0	26.0	12.0	2.0	100.0	50
Over 15	17.2	44.9	31.0	6.9	----	100.0	29
Total	13.5	47.0	29.3	7.9	2.3	100.0	266

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Teamwork

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	14.3	42.8	28.6	14.3	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	9.8	38.5	40.2	7.4	4.1	100.0	122
6 - 10	7.4	37.0	46.3	7.4	1.9	100.0	54
11 - 15	10.0	34.0	42.0	12.0	2.0	100.0	50
Over 15	10.3	44.9	37.9	6.9	----	100.0	29
Total	9.5	38.2	41.2	8.4	2.7	100.0	262

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	28.6	14.2	28.6	28.6	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	13.6	43.2	30.4	10.4	2.4	100.0	125
6 - 10	7.4	40.7	37.1	14.8	----	100.0	54
11 - 15	14.0	40.0	32.0	12.0	2.0	100.0	50
Over 15	13.8	51.7	27.6	6.9	----	100.0	29
Total	12.8	42.2	31.7	11.7	1.6	100.0	265

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Productivity

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	28.6	28.6	42.8	----	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	11.3	25.0	45.2	14.5	4.0	100.0	124
6 - 10	3.8	18.9	50.9	17.0	9.4	100.0	53
11 - 15	2.0	36.7	49.1	10.2	2.0	100.0	49
Over 15	17.2	34.5	41.4	6.9	----	100.0	29
Total	9.2	27.1	46.5	13.0	4.2	100.0	262

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I:: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Judging Work

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	14.3	28.6	42.8	14.3	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	12.4	25.7	50.4	7.1	4.4	100.0	113
6 - 10	5.7	20.8	54.6	15.1	3.8	100.0	53
11 - 15	2.3	38.6	54.5	2.3	2.3	100.0	44
Over 15	6.9	37.9	51.8	3.4	----	100.0	29
Total	8.5	28.5	52.0	7.7	3.3	100.0	246

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	14.3	57.1	14.3	14.3	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	19.2	40.8	25.6	8.8	5.6	100.0	125
6 - 10	14.8	29.6	33.3	16.7	5.6	100.0	54
11 - 15	18.7	45.9	22.9	10.4	2.1	100.0	48
Over 15	37.9	31.1	24.1	6.9	----	100.0	29
Total	20.2	38.8	26.2	10.6	4.2	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	28.6	42.8	14.3	----	14.3	100.0	7
1 - 5	23.2	36.0	33.6	5.6	1.6	100.0	125
6 - 10	16.7	37.0	38.8	5.6	1.9	100.0	54
11 - 15	22.0	44.0	28.0	4.0	2.0	100.0	50
Over 15	25.0	35.7	35.7	3.6	----	100.0	28
Total	22.0	37.9	33.3	4.9	1.9	100.0	264

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	28.6	42.8	28.6	----	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	12.2	43.8	35.0	4.9	4.1	100.0	123
6 - 10	13.7	19.6	58.8	5.9	2.0	100.0	51
11 - 15	16.7	39.6	35.4	6.2	2.1	100.0	48
Over 15	14.3	35.7	50.0	----	----	100.0	28
Total	14.0	37.4	41.2	4.7	2.7	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change Perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Trust

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	28.6	42.8	14.3	----	14.3	100.0	7
1 - 5	8.1	26.8	37.5	21.1	6.5	100.0	123
6 - 10	5.7	18.9	37.7	30.2	7.5	100.0	53
11 - 15	12.0	24.0	36.0	24.0	4.0	100.0	50
Over 15	17.2	24.1	41.5	13.8	3.4	100.0	29
Total	9.9	24.8	37.1	22.1	6.1	100.0	262

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Favoritism

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	----	50.0	33.3	16.7	----	100.0	6
1 - 5	4.1	15.4	56.1	16.3	8.1	100.0	123
6 - 10	1.9	13.2	50.9	18.9	15.1	100.0	53
11 - 15	2.1	23.4	48.9	25.6	----	100.0	47
Over 15	10.3	6.9	76.0	3.4	3.4	100.0	29
Total	3.9	16.3	55.3	17.1	7.4	100.0	258

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	----	40.0	60.0	----	----	100.0	5
1 - 5	10.0	23.3	45.9	15.8	5.0	100.0	120
6 - 10	3.8	17.0	47.2	24.5	7.5	100.0	53
11 - 15	8.3	18.7	58.4	12.5	2.1	100.0	48
Over 15	3.6	32.1	60.7	3.6	----	100.0	28
Total	7.5	22.4	50.4	15.4	4.3	100.0	254

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior or Dress

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	33.2	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	100.0	6
1 - 5	11.3	32.3	37.9	14.5	4.0	100.0	124
6 - 10	9.3	33.3	16.7	29.6	11.1	100.0	54
11 - 15	20.4	24.5	24.5	24.5	6.1	100.0	49
Over 15	28.6	21.4	25.0	14.3	10.7	100.0	28
Total	14.9	29.5	29.2	19.5	6.9	100.0	261

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	28.6	57.1	14.3	----	----	100.0	7
1-5	30.0	30.8	12.5	19.2	7.5	100.0	120
6 - 10	18.5	37.1	7.4	25.9	11.1	100.0	54
11 - 15	27.8	31.9	19.1	19.1	2.1	100.0	47
Over 15	31.0	27.7	17.2	24.1	----	100.0	29
Total	27.2	32.8	13.2	20.6	6.2	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Companies combined

Process Variable: Promotion

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	28.6	28.6	42.8	----	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	9.7	33.1	38.7	12.9	5.6	100.0	124
6 - 10	7.4	31.5	29.6	27.8	3.7	100.0	54
11 - 15	12.0	36.0	40.0	12.0	----	100.0	50
Over 15	10.7	39.3	39.3	10.7	----	100.0	28
Total	10.3	33.8	37.3	15.2	3.4	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	14.3	42.8	28.6	14.3	----	100.0	7
1 - 5	13.9	17.2	49.2	12.3	7.4	100.0	122
6 - 10	5.7	15.1	50.9	22.6	5.7	100.0	53
11 - 15	12.0	20.0	50.0	16.0	2.0	100.0	50
Over 15	3.4	24.1	65.6	6.9	----	100.0	29
Total	10.7	18.7	51.0	14.6	5.0	100.0	261

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	50.0	50.0	----	----	----	100.0	6
1 - 5	33.6	39.4	22.1	3.3	1.6	100.0	122
6 - 10	27.8	48.1	18.5	1.9	3.7	100.0	54
11 - 15	26.6	46.9	22.4	4.1	----	100.0	49
Over 15	30.8	38.4	30.8	----	----	100.0	26
Total	31.1	42.8	21.8	2.7	1.6	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Community Relations

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	50.0	33.3	16.7	----	----	100.0	6
1 - 5	20.2	47.9	25.2	4.2	2.5	100.0	119
6 - 10	19.6	41.2	23.5	13.7	2.0	100.0	51
11 - 15	19.6	32.6	30.4	15.2	2.2	100.0	46
Over 15	37.9	37.9	10.4	10.4	3.4	100.0	29
Total	22.7	42.2	23.9	8.8	2.4	100.0	251

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.6	----	100.0	6
1 - 5	4.8	22.2	63.5	6.3	3.2	100.0	126
6 - 10	5.6	20.4	59.2	11.1	3.7	100.0	54
11 - 15	4.1	26.5	59.2	8.2	2.0	100.0	49
Over 15	14.3	21.4	64.3	----	----	100.0	28
Total	6.1	22.4	61.6	7.2	2.7	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Red Tape

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7	----	100.0	6
1 - 5	0.8	11.8	69.7	11.8	5.9	100.0	119
6 - 10	1.9	15.1	56.6	24.5	1.9	100.0	53
11 - 15	2.1	22.9	58.3	16.7	----	100.0	48
Over 15	3.6	21.4	67.9	7.1	----	100.0	28
Total	2.0	16.1	63.8	15.0	3.1	100.0	254

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section I: Change perceived associated with years of service in company

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Grapevine

Years in Company	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Less than 1	40.0	----	40.0	20.0	----	100.0	5
1 - 5	5.9	10.1	57.2	17.6	9.2	100.0	119
6 - 10	5.8	15.4	46.1	21.2	11.5	100.0	52
11 - 15	15.2	19.6	56.5	6.5	2.2	100.0	46
Over 15	24.2	10.3	58.7	3.4	3.4	100.0	29
Total	10.4	12.7	54.6	14.7	7.6	100.0	251

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount And Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Communication

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	17.2	43.3	29.0	8.8	1.7	100.0	297
Black	26.4	51.6	16.5	4.4	1.1	100.0	91
Other	30.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	----	100.0	10
Total	19.6	45.0	26.1	7.8	1.5	100.0	398

Process Variable: Teamwork

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	12.6	35.7	40.8	8.5	2.4	100.0	294
Black	16.1	47.2	24.1	9.2	3.4	100.0	87
Other	40.0	20.0	30.0	10.0	----	100.0	10
Total	14.1	37.8	36.8	8.7	2.6	100.0	391

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	17.0	42.6	28.9	10.5	1.0	100.0	294
Black	28.6	42.8	20.9	5.5	2.2	100.0	91
Other	50.0	30.0	20.0	----	----	100.0	10
Total	20.5	42.3	26.8	9.1	1.3	100.0	395

Process Variable: Productivity

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	8.7	26.1	45.7	15.3	4.2	100.0	287
Black	18.9	44.5	33.3	2.2	1.1	100.0	90
Other	30.0	----	30.0	40.0	----	100.0	10
Total	11.6	29.7	42.4	12.9	3.4	100.0	387

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Judging Work

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	7.1	31.3	51.2	7.8	2.6	100.0	268
Black	28.1	31.5	32.6	6.7	1.1	100.0	89
Other	33.3	22.2	44.5	----	----	100.0	9
Total	12.8	31.1	46.5	7.4	2.2	100.0	366

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	22.4	38.6	27.6	7.6	3.8	100.0	290
Black	23.6	29.2	33.7	10.1	3.4	100.0	89
Other	40.0	20.0	30.0	10.0	----	100.0	10
Total	23.1	36.1	29.0	8.2	3.6	100.0	389

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	21.9	37.7	34.2	4.1	2.1	100.0	292
Black	39.2	28.7	28.7	3.4	----	100.0	87
Other	33.3	33.3	33.4	----	----	100.0	9
Total	26.0	35.6	33.0	3.9	1.5	100.0	388

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	14.8	35.2	43.3	4.2	2.5	100.0	284
Black	33.0	39.8	25.0	1.1	1.1	100.0	88
Other	22.3	33.3	33.3	11.1	----	100.0	9
Total	19.2	36.2	38.8	3.7	2.1	100.0	381

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Trust

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	11.8	25.6	38.0	20.4	4.2	100.0	289
Black	19.1	36.0	31.4	7.9	5.6	100.0	89
Other	33.4	22.2	22.2	11.1	11.1	100.0	9
Total	14.0	27.9	36.1	17.3	4.7	100.0	387

Process Variable: Favoritism

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	4.2	17.3	55.5	16.3	6.7	100.0	283
Black	4.7	27.9	51.1	10.5	5.8	100.0	86
Other	12.5	12.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	100.0	8
Total	4.5	19.6	54.4	14.9	6.6	100.0	377

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	8.8	20.8	52.4	14.8	3.2	100.0	283
Black	18.6	36.1	27.9	11.6	5.8	100.0	86
Other	44.5	11.1	33.3	----	11.1	100.0	9
Total	11.9	24.1	46.2	13.8	4.0	100.0	378

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior or Dress

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	15.4	29.0	28.7	20.6	6.3	100.0	286
Black	17.4	29.1	38.3	10.5	4.7	100.0	86
Other	-----	33.3	33.3	11.1	22.3	100.0	9
Total	15.5	29.1	31.0	18.1	6.3	100.0	381

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Changer perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	24.7	32.6	17.7	18.4	6.6	100.0	288
Black	40.0	35.3	17.6	5.9	1.2	100.0	85
Other	50.0	30.0	----	20.0	----	100.0	10
Total	28.7	33.2	17.2	15.7	5.2	100.0	383

Process Variable: Promotion

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	12.5	35.3	34.9	14.2	3.1	100.0	289
Black	20.9	31.9	36.2	6.6	4.4	100.0	91
Other	40.0	30.0	30.0	----	-----	100.0	10
Total	15.1	34.4	35.1	12.1	3.3	100.0	390

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	8.7	15.7	57.8	13.3	4.5	100.0	286
Black	13.8	23.0	32.2	24.1	6.9	100.0	87
Other	30.0	10.0	50.0	----	10.0	100.0	10
Total	10.4	17.2	51.8	15.4	5.2	100.0	383

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	34.3	40.3	19.9	3.8	1.7	100.0	286
Black	38.3	38.2	17.3	2.5	3.7	100.0	81
Other	60.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	----	100.0	10
Total	35.8	39.0	19.1	4.0	2.1	100.0	377

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change Perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Community Relations

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	20.1	46.0	24.1	8.0	1.8	100.0	274
Black	28.0	35.4	28.0	4.9	3.7	100.0	82
Other	40.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	100.0	10
Total	22.4	42.6	25.1	7.4	2.5	100.0	366

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	5.0	22.7	60.8	8.6	2.9	100.0	278
Black	12.8	26.7	45.4	9.3	5.8	100.0	86
Other	30.0	10.0	50.0	----	10.0	100.0	10
Total	7.5	23.2	57.0	8.6	3.7	100.0	374

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Red Tape

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	3.3	14.9	64.4	14.5	2.9	100.0	276
Black	5.0	18.7	55.0	13.8	7.5	100.0	80
Other	10.0	10.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	100.0	10
Total	3.8	15.6	61.8	14.2	4.6	100.0	366

Process Variable: Grapevine

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	8.8	13.2	56.8	13.9	7.3	100.0	273
Black	10.1	15.2	48.1	12.7	13.9	100.0	79
Other	11.1	11.1	33.4	22.2	22.2	100.0	9
Total	9.1	13.6	54.3	13.9	9.1	100.0	361

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Communication

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	29.3	43.9	18.3	8.5	----	100.0	82
Black	39.0	36.6	19.5	4.9	----	100.0	41
Other	25.0	37.5	37.5	----	----	100.0	8
Total	32.1	41.2	19.8	6.9	----	100.0	131

Process Variable: Teamwork

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	25.0	33.8	31.2	8.8	1.2	100.0	80
Black	17.5	47.5	20.0	10.0	5.0	100.0	40
Other	37.5	25.0	25.0	12.5	----	100.0	8
Total	23.4	37.6	27.3	9.4	2.3	100.0	128

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	34.6	44.5	16.0	4.9	----	100.0	81
Black	36.6	41.5	17.1	2.4	2.4	100.0	41
Other	50.0	25.0	25.0	----	----	100.0	8
Total	36.2	42.3	16.9	3.8	0.8	100.0	130

Process Variable: Productivity

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	15.6	32.5	36.3	13.0	2.6	100.0	77
Black	17.5	47.5	30.0	5.0	----	100.0	40
Other	25.0	----	25.0	50.0	----	100.0	8
Total	16.8	35.2	33.6	12.8	1.6	100.0	125

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Judging Work

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	13.9	40.3	36.1	9.7	----	100.0	72
Black	34.2	31.7	31.7	2.4	----	100.0	41
Other	28.6	28.6	42.8	----	----	100.0	7
Total	21.7	36.6	35.0	6.7	----	100.0	120

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	31.6	32.9	32.9	1.3	1.3	100.0	79
Black	23.1	28.2	38.5	5.1	5.1	100.0	39
Other	37.5	12.5	37.5	12.5	----	100.0	8
Total	29.4	30.2	34.8	3.2	2.4	100.0	126

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	30.4	34.2	32.8	1.3	1.3	100.0	79
Black	44.7	23.8	28.9	2.6	----	100.0	38
Other	28.6	28.6	42.8	----	----	100.0	7
Total	34.7	30.6	32.3	1.6	0.8	100.0	124

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	24.4	30.8	42.2	1.3	1.3	100.0	78
Black	43.6	38.5	17.9	----	----	100.0	39
Other	14.3	42.8	28.6	14.3	----	100.0	7
Total	29.8	33.9	33.9	1.6	0.8	100.0	124

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Trust

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	19.5	35.1	36.3	9.1	----	100.0	77
Black	28.2	30.8	33.3	2.6	5.1	100.0	39
Other	28.6	28.6	28.6	14.2	----	100.0	7
Total	22.8	33.3	35.0	7.3	1.6	100.0	123

Process Variable: Favoritism

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	5.4	24.3	55.4	10.8	4.1	100.0	74
Black	7.7	33.3	43.6	7.7	7.7	100.0	39
Other	----	16.7	66.6	16.7	----	100.0	6
Total	5.9	26.9	52.1	10.1	5.0	100.0	119

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	18.2	24.7	44.1	11.7	1.3	100.0	77
Black	22.5	35.0	25.0	10.0	7.5	100.0	40
Other	42.9	14.2	42.9	----	----	100.0	7
Total	21.0	27.4	37.9	10.5	3.2	100.0	124

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior or Dress

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	16.0	33.3	30.7	16.0	4.0	100.0	75
Black	21.1	18.4	44.7	13.2	2.6	100.0	38
Other	----	28.6	28.6	14.2	28.6	100.0	7
Total	16.7	28.3	35.0	15.0	5.0	100.0	120

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	48.0	31.2	14.3	5.2	1.3	100.0	77
Black	37.1	34.3	14.3	5.7	8.6	100.0	35
Other	62.5	12.5	----	25.0	----	100.0	8
Total	45.9	30.8	13.3	6.7	3.3	100.0	120

Process Variable: Community Relations

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	19.4	51.4	26.4	2.8	----	100.0	72
Black	22.9	37.1	28.6	5.7	5.7	100.0	35
Other	37.5	----	37.5	12.5	12.5	100.0	8
Total	21.7	43.6	27.8	4.3	2.6	100.0	115

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	6.1	30.3	48.5	13.6	1.5	100.0	66
Black	16.2	18.9	40.6	10.8	13.5	100.0	37
Other	25.0	12.5	50.0	----	12.5	100.0	8
Total	10.8	25.3	45.9	11.7	6.3	100.0	111

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	26.6	31.6	30.4	7.6	3.8	100.0	79
Black	38.5	38.5	20.5	----	2.5	100.0	39
Other	50.0	37.5	----	12.5	----	100.0	8
Total	31.7	34.1	25.4	5.6	3.2	100.0	126

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentage:

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Promotion

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	24.4	38.4	30.8	5.1	1.3	100.0	78
Black	24.4	29.3	31.7	7.3	7.3	100.0	41
Other	37.5	37.5	25.0	----	----	100.0	8
Total	25.2	35.5	30.7	5.5	3.1	100.0	127

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	10.5	10.5	68.5	7.9	2.6	100.0	76
Black	5.3	21.1	23.7	39.4	10.5	100.0	38
Other	25.0	12.5	50.0	----	12.5	100.0	8
Total	9.8	13.9	53.4	17.2	5.7	100.0	122

*N = Total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Red Tape

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	8.6	10.0	68.6	11.4	1.4	100.0	70
Black	5.9	23.5	41.2	14.7	14.7	100.0	34
Other	12.5	12.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	100.0	8
Total	8.0	14.3	57.2	12.5	8.0	100.0	112

Process Variable: Grapevine

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	5.7	14.3	62.9	11.4	5.7	100.0	70
Black	6.1	18.2	42.4	9.1	24.2	100.0	33
Other	14.2	14.2	14.2	28.7	28.7	100.0	7
Total	6.4	15.5	53.6	11.8	12.7	100.0	110

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Communication

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	12.6	43.3	33.0	8.8	2.3	100.0	215
Black	16.0	64.0	14.0	4.0	2.0	100.0	50
Other	50.0	----	----	50.0	----	100.0	2
Total	13.5	46.9	29.2	8.2	2.2	100.0	267

Process Variable: Teamwork

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	7.9	36.4	44.5	8.4	2.8	100.0	214
Black	14.9	46.8	27.7	8.5	2.1	100.0	47
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	9.5	38.0	41.4	8.4	2.7	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Getting along With People

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	10.3	41.8	33.8	12.7	1.4	100.0	213
Black	22.0	44.0	24.0	8.0	2.0	100.0	50
Other	50.0	50.0	----	----	----	100.0	2
Total	12.8	42.3	31.7	11.7	1.5	100.0	265

Process Variable: Productivity

Cultural, Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	6.2	23.8	49.0	16.2	4.8	100.0	210
Black	20.0	42.0	36.0	----	2.0	100.0	50
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	9.2	27.1	46.5	13.0	4.2	100.0	262

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Judging Work

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	4.6	28.1	56.6	7.1	3.6	100.0	196
Black	22.9	31.2	33.4	10.4	2.1	100.0	48
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	8.5	28.5	52.0	7.7	3.3	100.0	246

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	19.0	40.7	25.6	10.0	4.7	100.0	211
Black	24.0	30.0	30.0	14.0	2.0	100.0	50
Other	50.0	50.0	----	----	----	100.0	2
Total	20.2	38.8	26.2	10.6	4.2	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	18.8	39.0	34.7	5.2	2.3	100.0	213
Black	34.6	32.7	28.6	4.1	----	100.0	49
Other	50.0	50.0	----	----	----	100.0	2
Total	22.0	37.9	33.3	4.9	1.9	100.0	264

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	11.2	36.9	43.7	5.3	2.9	100.0	206
Black	24.5	40.9	30.6	2.0	2.0	100.0	49
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	14.0	37.4	41.2	4.7	2.7	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Trust

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	9.0	22.2	38.6	24.5	5.7	100.0	212
Black	12.0	40.0	30.0	12.0	6.0	100.0	50
Other	50.0	----	----	----	50.0	100.0	2
Total	9.8	25.4	36.7	22.0	6.1	100.0	264

Process Variable: Favoritism

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	3.8	14.8	55.5	18.2	7.7	100.0	209
Black	2.1	23.4	57.4	12.8	4.3	100.0	47
Other	50.0	----	----	----	50.0	100.0	2
Total	3.9	16.3	55.3	17.1	7.4	100.0	258

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	5.3	19.4	55.4	16.0	3.9	100.0	206
Black	15.2	37.0	30.5	13.0	4.3	100.0	46
Other	50.0	----	----	----	50.0	100.0	2
Total	7.5	22.4	50.4	15.4	4.3	100.0	254

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior or Dress

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	15.2	27.4	28.0	22.3	7.1	100.0	211
Black	14.6	37.6	33.3	8.3	6.2	100.0	48
Other	----	50.0	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	14.9	29.5	29.2	19.5	6.9	100.0	261

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating
Amount and Direction of Change in Personal
Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	23.9	33.0	12.9	22.5	7.7	100.0	209
Black	41.3	32.6	15.2	10.9	----	100.0	46
Other	50.0	----	----	50.0	----	100.0	2
Total	27.2	32.8	13.2	20.6	6.2	100.0	257

Process Variable: Promotion

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	8.1	34.1	36.5	17.5	3.8	100.0	211
Black	18.0	34.0	40.0	6.0	2.0	100.0	50
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	10.3	33.8	37.3	15.2	3.4	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating
Amount and Direction of Change in Personal
Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Layoff Procedures

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	8.1	17.6	53.9	15.2	5.2	100.0	210
Black	20.4	24.5	38.8	12.2	4.1	100.0	49
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	10.7	18.7	51.0	14.6	5.0	100.0	261

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	20.6	41.6	32.5	3.3	1.9	100.0	209
Black	39.1	41.3	19.6	----	----	100.0	46
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	24.1	41.2	30.4	2.7	1.6	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Community Relations

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	20.3	44.0	23.3	9.9	2.5	100.0	202
Black	31.9	34.0	27.7	4.3	2.1	100.0	47
Other	50.0	50.0	----	----	----	100.0	2
Total	22.7	42.2	23.9	8.8	2.4	100.0	251

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	4.7	20.3	64.6	7.1	3.3	100.0	212
Black	10.2	32.6	49.0	8.2	----	100.0	49
Other	50.0	----	50.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	6.1	22.4	61.6	7.2	2.7	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section II: Change perceived associated with cultural/racial background

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Red Tape

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	1.5	16.5	63.1	15.5	3.4	100.0	206
Black	4.3	15.2	65.3	13.0	2.2	100.0	46
Other	----	----	100.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	2.0	16.1	63.8	15.0	3.1	100.0	254

Process Variable: Grapevine

Cultural Racial Background	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
White	9.9	12.8	54.6	14.8	7.9	100.0	203
Black	13.0	13.0	52.3	15.2	6.5	100.0	46
Other	----	----	100.0	----	----	100.0	2
Total	10.4	12.7	54.6	14.7	7.6	100.0	251

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Communication

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	19.1	41.6	25.8	10.7	2.8	100.0	178
Foreman Supervisor	24.3	44.3	24.3	7.1	----	100.0	70
Prof. Staff	17.2	53.1	23.5	6.2	----	100.0	64
Manager	7.3	60.0	29.1	3.6	----	100.0	55
Other	38.8	29.0	29.0	----	3.2	100.0	31
Total	19.6	45.5	25.9	7.5	1.5	100.0	398

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Teamwork

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	13.3	35.3	40.5	6.9	4.0	100.0	173
Foreman Supervisor	21.4	27.2	32.9	17.1	1.4	100.0	70
Prof. Staff	8.1	51.5	33.9	6.5	----	100,0	62
Manager	7.3	41.8	47.3	3.6	----	100.0	55
Other	25.0	43.8	15.6	9.4	6.2	100.0	32
Total	14.0	38.0	37.0	8.4	2.6	100.0	392

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	18.5	38.8	29.8	11.2	1.7	100.0	178
Foreman/ Supervisor	25.7	41.4	20.0	12.9	----	100.0	70
Prof. Staff	14.3	46.0	38.1	1.6	----	100.0	63
Manager	14.5	54.6	21.8	9.1	----	100.0	55
Other	43.3	36.7	13.3	----	6.7	100.0	30
Total	20.5	42.4	27.0	8.8	1.3	100.0	396

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Productivity

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	13.1	31.2	34.7	15.3	5.7	100.0	176
Foreman/ Supervisor	11.6	29.0	39.2	18.8	1.4	100.0	69
Prof. Staff	6.5	32.3	53.1	6.5	1.6	100.0	62
Manager	3.8	25.0	63.5	7.7	----	100.0	52
Other	26.7	26.7	36.6	6.7	3.3	100.0	30
Total	11.6	29.8	42.4	12.9	3.3	100.0	389

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Judging Work

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	14.2	30.2	43.7	8.3	3.6	100.0	169
Foreman/ Supervisor	14.7	29.4	42.6	11.8	1.5	100.0	68
Prof. Staff	8.8	42.1	43.8	5.3	----	100.0	57
Manager	2.1	29.8	66.0	2.1	----	100.0	47
Other	25.9	22.2	44.5	3.7	3.7	100.0	27
Total	12.8	31.2	46.5	7.3	2.2	100.0	368

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	20.6	28.6	31.3	12.6	6.9	100.0	175
Foreman/ Supervisor	25.7	38.6	28.6	7.1	----	100.0	70
Prof. Staff	24.2	48.4	21.0	3.2	3.2	100.0	62
Manager	20.8	47.1	30.2	1.9	----	100.0	53
Other	33.3	30.0	30.0	6.7	----	100.0	30
Total	23.1	36.1	29.0	8.2	3.6	100.0	390

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	22.7	32.4	35.3	6.8	2.8	100.0	176
Foreman/ Supervisor	31.9	42.7	24.6	1.4	----	100.0	69
Prof. Staff	20.6	46.1	31.7	----	1.6	100.0	63
Manager	22.2	38.9	37.0	1.9	----	100.0	54
Other	51.7	13.8	31.1	3.4	----	100.0	29
Total	26.1	35.8	32.8	3.8	1.5	100.0	391

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	20.0	34.1	37.1	5.3	3.5	100.0	170
Foreman/ Supervisor	23.5	33.9	39.7	2.9	----	100.0	68
Prof. Staff	8.1	40.3	48.4	1.6	1.6	100.0	62
Manager	9.4	43.4	45.3	1.9	----	100.0	53
Other	44.9	34.5	13.8	3.4	3.4	100.0	29
Total	19.1	36.4	38.7	3.7	2.1	100.0	382

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Trust

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	14.5	19.2	45.4	14.5	6.4	100.0	172
Foreman/ Supervisor	19.1	25.0	29.5	23.5	2.9	100.0	68
Prof. Staff	6.3	41.3	34.9	15.9	1.6	100.0	63
Manager	5.6	38.9	29.6	22.2	3.7	100.0	54
Other	31.0	31.0	17.3	13.8	6.9	100.0	29
Total	14.0	27.5	36.4	17.4	4.7	100.0	386

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Favoritism

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	4.7	17.5	52.6	15.8	9.4	100.0	171
Foreman/ Supervisor	5.9	22.1	52.9	13.2	5.9	100.0	68
Prof. Staff	3.3	19.7	57.3	14.8	4.9	100.0	61
Manager	1.9	21.2	59.6	17.3	----	100.0	52
Other	7.7	23.1	53.8	7.7	7.7	100.0	26
Total	4.5	19.6	54.5	14.8	6.6	100.0	378

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	12.9	20.0	42.4	18.8	5.9	100.0	170
Foreman/ Supervisor	15.9	23.2	43.5	14.5	2.9	100.0	69
Prof. Staff	8.3	33.3	45.0	11.7	1.7	100.0	60
Manager	5.7	28.3	62.2	3.8	----	100.0	53
Other	14.3	25.0	50.0	3.6	7.1	100.0	28
Total	11.8	24.2	46.4	13.7	3.9	100.0	380

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior or Dress

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	13.9	17.3	34.7	23.7	10.4	100.0	173
Foreman/ Supervisor	16.2	29.4	25.0	25.0	4.4	100.0	68
Prof. Staff	14.3	46.0	38.1	1.6	----	100.0	60
Manager	14.8	50.0	24.0	9.3	1.9	100.0	54
Other	18.5	29.6	40.8	7.4	3.7	100.0	27
Total	15.4	29.3	30.9	18.1	6.3	100.0	382

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	22.7	27.5	16.8	24.0	9.0	100.0	167
Foreman/ Supervisor	30.0	31.4	17.1	18.6	2.9	100.0	70
Prof. Staff	35.9	32.9	21.9	6.2	3.1	100.0	64
Manager	30.9	52.8	12.7	1.8	1.8	100.0	55
Other	37.9	34.5	20.7	6.9	----	100.0	29
Total	28.6	33.2	17.4	15.6	5.2	100.0	385

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Promotion

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	10.3	28.7	36.3	18.4	6.3	100.0	174
Foreman/ Supervisor	21.7	37.8	30.4	10.1	----	100.0	69
Prof. Staff	19.0	38.1	36.5	4.8	1.6	100.0	63
Manager	14.8	46.3	35.2	3.7	----	100.0	54
Other	18.8	31.2	37.5	9.4	3.1	100.0	32
Total	15.1	34.4	35.2	12.0	3.3	100.0	392

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	9.4	16.4	46.2	18.1	9.9	100.0	171
Foreman/ Supervisor	12.8	10.0	60.0	14.3	2.9	100.0	70
Prof. Staff	11.3	16.1	53.2	19.4	----	100.0	62
Manager	9.3	35.2	51.8	3.7	----	100.0	54
Other	11.1	7.4	63.0	14.8	3.7	100.0	27
Total	10.4	17.2	51.8	15.4	5.2	100.0	384

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	31.9	39.2	19.9	6.0	3.0	100.0	166
Foreman/ Supervisor	39.1	36.3	20.3	2.9	1.4	100.0	69
Prof. Staff	37.2	41.9	16.1	1.6	3.2	100.0	62
Manager	43.7	40.0	14.5	1.8	----	100.0	55
Other	34.6	34.6	26.9	3.9	----	100.0	26
Total	36.0	38.9	19.0	4.0	2.1	100.0	378

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Community Relations

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	17.0	40.0	28.5	9.7	4.8	100.0	165
Foreman/ Supervisory	28.8	42.5	24.2	3.0	1.5	100.0	66
Prof. Staff	27.0	42.9	23.8	6.3	----	100.0	63
Manager	19.6	56.9	17.6	5.9	----	100.0	51
Other	36.4	31.8	22.7	9.1	----	100.0	22
Total	22.3	42.7	25.1	7.4	2.5	100.0	367

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	8.7	24.4	47.7	12.2	7.0	100.0	172
Foreman/ Supervisor	5.8	24.6	62.4	5.8	1.4	100.0	69
Prof. Staff	6.6	19.7	65.5	6.6	1.6	100.0	61
Manager	1.8	20.0	74.6	3.6	----	100.0	55
Other	14.3	21.4	60.7	3.6	----	100.0	28
Total	7.3	22.9	57.9	8.3	3.6	100.0	385

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Red Tape

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	3.1	12.9	59.5	16.5	8.0	100.0	163
Foreman/ Supervisor	6.2	16.9	63.1	12.3	1.5	100.0	65
Prof. Staff	3.3	26.2	54.1	14.8	1.6	100.0	61
Manager	1.9	11.1	79.6	7.4	----	100.0	54
Other	8.7	13.0	52.2	17.4	8.7	100.0	23
Total	3.8	15.6	61.8	14.2	4.6	100.0	366

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part A: Companies combined

Process Variable: Grapevine

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	8.6	8.6	51.9	14.2	16.7	100.0	162
Foreman/ Supervisor	16.2	17.6	47.1	13.2	5.9	100.0	68
Prof. Staff	5.4	16.1	60.6	16.1	1.8	100.0	56
Manager	5.9	23.5	62.8	7.8	----	100.0	51
Other	8.3	8.3	58.4	20.8	4.2	100.0	24
Total	9.1	13.6	54.3	13.9	9.0	100.0	361

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Communication

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	34.8	39.1	17.4	8.7	----	100.0	46
Foreman/ Supervisor	44.5	29.6	18.5	7.4	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	22.7	50.0	18.2	9.1	----	100.0	22
Manager	----	86.6	6.7	6.7	----	100.0	15
Other	40.9	27.3	31.8	----	----	100.0	22
Total	31.8	42.5	18.9	6.8	----	100.0	132

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Teamwork

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	25.0	38.6	27.3	6.8	2.3	100.0	44
Foreman/ Supervisor	29.6	29.6	25.9	11.2	3.7	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	19.0	42.9	28.6	9.5	----	100.0	21
Manager	13.3	33.3	46.7	6.7	----	100.0	15
Other	21.7	43.6	21.7	8.7	4.3	100.0	23
Total	23.1	37.6	28.5	8.5	2.3	100.0	130

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	37.0	41.2	19.6	2.2	----	100.0	46
Foreman/ Supervisor	33.3	40.8	18.5	7.4	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	31.8	45.5	22.7	----	----	100.0	22
Manager	33.3	46.7	13.3	6.7	----	100.0	15
Other	42.9	42.9	9.4	----	4.8	100.0	21
Total	35.9	42.6	17.6	3.1	0.8	100.0	131

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Productivity

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	15.9	40.9	25.0	15.9	2.3	100.0	44
Foreman/ Supervisory	18.5	37.1	22.2	18.5	3.7	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	14.3	33.3	42.9	9.5	----	100.0	21
Manager	7.1	21.4	64.4	7.1	----	100.0	14
Other	23.8	33.3	38.1	4.8	----	100.0	21
Total	16.5	35.4	33.9	12.6	1.6	100.0	127

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Judging Work

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	21.4	38.1	35.7	4.8	----	100.0	42
Foreman/ Supervisor	29.6	25.9	29.6	14.9	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	19.0	52.4	23.8	4.8	----	100.0	21
Manager	----	38.5	53.8	7.7	----	100.0	13
Other	26.3	31.6	42.1	----	----	100.0	19
Total	21.3	36.9	35.2	6.6	----	100.0	122

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	29.6	20.5	38.6	6.8	4.5	100.0	44
Foreman/ Supervisor	25.9	33.3	40.8	----	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	33.3	42.9	19.0	----	4.8	100.0	21
Manager	21.4	42.9	35.7	----	----	100.0	14
Other	33.3	28.6	33.3	4.8	----	100.0	21
Total	29.1	30.7	34.7	3.1	2.4	100.0	127

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	35.6	28.9	33.3	----	2.2	100.0	45
Foreman/ Supervisor	40.8	29.6	25.9	3.7	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	28.6	47.6	23.8	----	----	100.0	21
Manager	21.4	35.7	42.9	----	----	100.0	14
Other	40.0	20.0	35.0	5.0	----	100.0	20
Total	34.6	31.5	31.5	1.6	0.8	100.0	127

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	31.0	33.3	33.3	2.4	----	100.0	42
Foreman/ Supervisor	33.3	25.9	40.8	----	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	18.2	45.4	31.8	----	4.6	100.0	22
Manager	14.3	35.7	50.0	----	----	100.0	14
Other	45.0	35.0	15.0	5.0	----	100.0	20
Total	29.6	34.4	33.6	1.6	0.8	100.0	125

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Trust

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	32.6	20.9	41.9	2.3	2.3	100.0	43
Foreman/ Supervisor	19.2	30.8	42.3	7.7	----	100.0	26
Prof. Staff	14.3	33.3	38.1	14.3	----	100.0	21
Manager	----	71.4	28.6	----	----	100.0	14
Other	30.0	35.0	15.0	15.0	5.0	100.0	20
Total	22.6	33.1	35.4	7.3	1.6	100.0	124

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Favoritism

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	9.3	23.3	53.4	9.3	4.7	100.0	43
Foreman/ Supervisor	11.5	15.4	57.7	7.7	7.7	100.0	26
Prof. Staff	----	35.0	40.0	20.0	5.0	100.0	20
Manager	----	50.0	42.9	7.1	----	100.0	14
Other	----	23.5	64.7	5.9	5.9	100.0	17
Total	5.8	26.7	52.5	10.0	5.0	100.0	120

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	23.3	20.9	41.8	9.3	4.7	100.0	43
Foreman/ Supervisor	29.6	22.3	29.6	14.8	3.7	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	19.0	28.6	38.1	14.3	----	100.0	21
Manager	13.3	53.3	26.7	6.7	----	100.0	15
Other	10.0	30.0	50.0	5.0	5.0	100.0	20
Total	20.6	27.8	38.1	10.3	3.2	100.0	126

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior or Dress

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	18.6	11.6	44.2	16.3	9.3	100.0	43
Foreman/ Supervisor	14.9	25.9	29.6	25.9	3.7	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	21.1	42.0	31.6	5.3	----	100.0	19
Manager	7.1	78.7	----	7.1	7.1	100.0	14
Other	16.7	22.2	50.0	11.1	----	100.0	18
Total	16.5	28.9	34.7	14.9	5.0	100.0	121

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	40.5	30.9	11.9	11.9	4.8	100.0	42
Foreman/ Supervisor	44.5	25.9	22.2	3.7	3.7	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	55.0	35.0	----	5.0	5.0	100.0	20
Manager	80.0	20.0	----	----	----	100.0	15
Other	23.5	41.2	29.4	5.9	----	100.0	17
Total	46.3	30.6	13.2	6.6	3.3	100.0	121

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Community Relations

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	19.0	40.5	28.6	4.8	7.1	100.0	42
Foreman/ Supervisor	26.9	46.2	26.9	----	----	100.0	26
Prof. Staff	23.8	42.8	28.6	4.8	----	100.0	21
Manager	21.4	57.2	21.4	----	----	100.0	14
Other	15.4	38.4	30.8	15.4	----	100.0	13
Total	21.6	44.0	27.5	4.3	2.6	100.0	116

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	14.3	11.9	40.5	19.0	14.3	100.0	42
Foreman/ Supervisor	7.4	29.6	55.6	7.4	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	5.3	26.3	52.6	10.5	5.3	100.0	19
Manager	----	46.7	53.3	----	----	100.0	15
Other	15.6	21.2	57.9	5.3	----	100.0	19
Total	9.8	23.8	50.0	10.7	5.7	100.0	122

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	27.3	31.8	34.1	4.5	2.3	100.0	44
Foreman/ Supervisor	29.6	33.4	22.2	11.1	3.7	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	22.7	45.6	22.7	4.5	4.5	100.0	22
Manager	46.6	26.7	20.0	----	6.7	100.0	15
Other	40.0	35.0	20.0	5.0	----	100.0	20
Total	31.3	34.5	25.6	5.5	3.1	100.0	128

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Promotion

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	13.6	38.7	34.1	9.1	4.5	100.0	44
Foreman/ Supervisor	29.6	37.1	29.6	3.7	----	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	38.0	28.6	28.6	----	4.8	100.0	21
Manager	35.7	42.9	21.4	----	----	100.0	14
Other	21.7	30.4	34.9	8.7	4.3	100.0	23
Total	24.8	35.7	31.0	5.4	3.1	100.0	129

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company Y

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	2.3	18.2	40.9	29.5	9.1	100.0	44
Foreman/ Supervisor	22.2	11.1	55.6	3.7	7.4	100.0	27
Prof. Staff	15.0	5.0	65.0	15.0	----	100.0	20
Manager	7.1	35.7	57.2	----	----	100.0	14
Other	5.6	----	66.7	22.1	5.6	100.0	18
Total	9.8	13.8	53.6	17.1	5.7	100.0	123

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company Y

Process Variable: Red Tape

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	7.9	10.5	50.0	15.8	15.8	100.0	38
Foreman/ Supervisor	11.5	15.4	57.8	11.5	3.8	100.0	26
Prof. Staff	5.3	31.6	52.6	10.5	----	100.0	19
Manager	7.1	----	85.8	7.1	----	100.0	14
Other	6.7	13.3	53.4	13.3	13.3	100.0	15
Total	8.0	14.3	57.2	12.5	8.0	100.0	112

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part B: Company X

Process Variable: Grapevine

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	2.6	12.8	48.7	12.8	23.1	100.0	39
Foreman/ Supervisor	15.4	19.2	46.2	7.7	11.5	100.0	26
Prof. Staff	5.9	17.6	58.8	11.8	5.9	100.0	17
Manager	----	25.0	75.0	----	----	100.0	12
Other	6.2	6.2	56.3	25.1	6.2	100.0	16
Total	6.4	15.5	53.6	11.8	12.7	100.0	110

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Communication

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	13.6	42.4	28.8	11.4	3.8	100.0	132
Foreman/ Supervisor	11.6	53.5	27.9	7.0	----	100.0	43
Prof. Staff	14.3	54.7	26.2	4.8	----	100.0	42
Manager	10.0	50.0	37.5	2.5	----	100.0	40
Other	33.3	33.3	22.3	----	11.1	100.0	9
Total	13.5	47.0	29.3	7.9	2.3	100.0	266

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of postion

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Teamwork

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	9.3	34.0	45.0	7.0	4.7	100.0	129
Foreman/ Supervisor	16.3	25.6	37.2	20.9	----	100.0	43
Prof. Staff	2.4	56.1	36.6	4.9	----	100.0	41
Manager	5.0	45.0	47.5	2.5	----	100.0	40
Other	33.3	44.5	----	11.1	11.1	100.0	9
Total	9.5	38.2	41.2	8.4	2.7	100.0	262

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Getting Along with People

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	12.1	37.9	33.3	14.4	2.3	100.0	132
Foreman/ Supervisor	20.9	41.9	20.9	16.3	----	100.0	43
Prof. Staff	4.9	46.3	46.3	2.5	----	100.0	41
Manager	7.5	57.5	25.0	10.0	----	100.0	40
Other	44.5	22.2	22.2	----	11.1	100.0	9
Total	12.8	42.3	31.7	11.7	1.5	100.0	265

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Productivity

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	12.1	28.0	37.9	15.2	6.8	100.0	132
Foreman/ Supervisor	7.1	23.9	50.0	19.0	----	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	2.4	31.7	58.6	4.9	2.4	100.0	41
Manager	2.6	26.3	63.2	7.9	----	100.0	38
Other	33.3	11.1	33.4	11.1	11.1	100.0	9
Total	9.2	27.1	46.5	13.0	4.2	100.0	262

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Judging Work

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	11.8	27.6	46.5	9.4	4.7	100.0	127
Foreman/ Supervisor	4.9	31.7	51.2	9.8	2.4	100.0	41
Prof. Staff	2.8	36.1	55.5	5.6	----	100.0	36
Manager	2.9	26.5	70.6	----	----	100.0	34
Other	25.0	----	50.0	12.5	12.5	100.0	8
Total	8.5	28.5	52.0	7.7	3.3	100.0	246

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Concern for Individual's Welfare

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	17.6	31.3	29.0	14.5	7.6	100.0	131
Foreman/ Supervisor	25.6	41.9	20.9	11.6	----	100.0	43
Prof. Staff	19.5	51.2	22.0	4.9	2.4	100.0	41
Manager	20.5	48.7	28.2	2.6	----	100.0	39
Other	33.3	33.3	22.3	11.1	----	100.0	9
Total	20.2	38.8	26.2	10.6	4.2	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Talking to Higher Management

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	18.4	33.6	35.7	9.2	3.1	100.0	131
Foreman/ Supervisor	26.2	50.0	23.8	----	----	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	16.7	45.2	35.7	----	2.4	100.0	42
Manager	22.5	40.0	35.0	2.5	----	100.0	40
Other	77.8	----	22.2	----	----	100.0	9
Total	22.0	37.9	33.3	4.9	1.9	100.0	264

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Personal Achievement

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	16.4	34.4	38.3	6.2	4.7	100.0	128
Foreman/ Supervisor	17.1	39.0	39.0	4.9	----	100.0	41
Prof. Staff	2.5	37.5	57.5	2.5	----	100.0	40
Manager	7.7	46.1	43.6	2.6	----	100.0	39
Other	44.5	33.3	11.1	----	11.1	100.0	9
Total	14.0	37.4	41.2	4.7	2.7	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Trust

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	8.5	18.6	46.5	18.6	7.8	100.0	129
Foreman/ Supervisor	19.0	21.4	21.4	33.4	4.8	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	2.4	45.2	33.3	16.7	2.4	100.0	42
Manager	7.5	27.5	30.0	30.0	5.0	100.0	40
Other	33.4	22.2	22.2	11.1	11.1	100.0	9
Total	9.9	24.8	37.1	22.1	6.1	100.0	262

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Favoritism

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	3.1	15.6	52.4	18.0	10.9	100.0	128
Foreman/ Supervisor	2.4	26.1	50.0	16.7	4.8	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	4.9	12.2	65.8	12.2	4.9	100.0	41
Manager	2.6	10.5	65.8	21.1	----	100.0	38
Other	22.2	22.2	33.4	11.1	11.1	100.0	9
Total	3.9	16.3	55.3	17.1	7.4	100.0	258

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Fairness in Assigning Work

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	9.4	19.7	42.6	22.0	6.3	100.0	127
Foreman/ Supervisor	7.1	23.8	52.4	14.3	2.4	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	2.6	35.9	48.6	10.3	2.6	100.0	39
Manager	2.6	18.4	76.4	2.6	----	100.0	38
Other	25.0	12.5	50.0	----	12.5	100.0	8
Total	7.5	22.4	50.4	15.4	4.3	100.0	254

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Reaction to New Behavior and Dress

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	12.3	19.2	31.5	26.2	10.8	100.0	130
Foreman/ Supervisor	17.1	31.6	22.0	24.4	4.9	100.0	41
Prof. Staff	17.1	46.4	26.8	7.3	2.4	100.0	41
Manager	17.5	40.0	32.5	10.0	----	100.0	40
Other	22.2	44.5	22.2	----	11.1	100.0	9
Total	14.9	29.5	29.2	19.5	6.9	100.0	261

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Money for Training and Education

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	29.1	41.9	22.6	4.0	2.4	100.0	124
Foreman/ Supervisor	35.7	42.9	19.0	2.4	----	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	28.6	45.2	23.8	----	2.4	100.0	42
Manager	30.0	47.5	20.0	2.5	----	100.0	40
Other	55.6	22.2	22.2	----	----	100.0	9
Total	31.1	42.8	21.8	2.7	1.6	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Community Relations

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	16.3	39.7	28.5	11.4	4.1	100.0	123
Foreman/ Supervisor	30.0	40.0	22.5	5.0	2.5	100.0	40
Prof. Staff	28.6	42.9	21.4	7.1	----	100.0	42
Manager	18.9	56.8	16.2	8.1	----	100.0	37
Other	66.7	22.2	11.1	----	----	100.0	9
Total	22.7	42.2	23.9	8.8	2.4	100.0	251

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Setting Pay Rates

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	6.9	28.5	50.0	10.0	4.6	100.0	130
Foreman/ Supervisor	4.7	21.4	66.7	4.8	2.4	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	7.1	16.7	71.4	4.8	----	100.0	42
Manager	2.5	10.0	82.5	5.0	----	100.0	40
Other	11.1	22.2	66.7	----	----	100.0	9
Total	6.1	22.4	61.6	7.2	2.7	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Hiring Practices

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	21.1	26.0	10.6	30.9	11.4	100.0	123
Foreman/ Supervisor	30.2	30.2	14.0	23.3	2.3	100.0	43
Prof. Staff	42.9	26.2	21.4	7.1	2.4	100.0	42
Manager	25.0	62.5	10.0	2.5	----	100.0	40
Other	33.3	33.3	22.3	11.1	----	100.0	9
Total	27.3	32.7	13.2	20.6	6.2	100.0	257

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Promotion

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	9.2	25.5	36.9	21.5	6.9	100.0	130
Foreman/ Supervisor	16.7	38.0	31.0	14.3	----	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	9.5	42.9	40.5	7.1	----	100.0	42
Manager	7.5	47.5	40.0	5.0	----	100.0	40
Other	11.1	33.3	44.5	11.1	----	100.0	9
Total	10.3	33.8	37.3	15.2	3.4	100.0	263

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Layoff Processes

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	11.8	15.7	48.1	14.2	10.2	100.0	127
Foreman/ Supervisor	7.0	9.3	62.8	20.9	----	100.0	43
Prof. Staff	9.5	21.4	47.7	21.4	----	100.0	42
Manager	10.0	35.0	50.0	5.0	----	100.0	40
Other	22.2	22.2	55.6	----	----	100.0	9
Total	10.7	18.8	50.9	14.6	5.0	100.0	261

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Red Tape

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	1.6	13.6	62.4	16.8	5.6	100.0	125
Foreman/ Supervisor	2.6	17.9	66.7	12.8	----	100.0	39
Prof. Staff	2.4	23.8	54.7	16.7	2.4	100.0	42
Manager	----	15.0	77.5	7.5	----	100.0	40
Other	12.5	12.5	50.0	25.0	----	100.0	8
Total	2.0	16.1	63.8	15.0	3.1	100.0	254

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Percentage Distribution of Answers Indicating Amount and Direction of Change in Personal Interrelationships and Organizational Processes

Section III: Change perceived associated with level of position

Part C: Company Y

Process Variable: Grapevine

Level of Position	Amount and Direction of Change					Total	
	Much Better	Better	No Change	Worse	Much Worse	Percent	N*
Hourly	10.6	7.3	52.9	14.6	14.6	100.0	123
Foreman/ Supervisor	16.7	16.7	47.5	16.7	2.4	100.0	42
Prof. Staff	5.1	15.4	61.6	17.9	----	100.0	39
Manager	7.7	23.1	58.9	10.3	----	100.0	39
Other	12.5	12.5	62.5	12.5	----	100.0	8
Total	10.4	12.7	54.6	14.7	7.6	100.0	251

*N = total number of observations used in calculating percentages

Analyses of Questionnaire Data and Activity Indices

Whenever quantitative data are obtained on personal and social characteristics, it is necessary to answer the question of their significance of "factuality". This includes answering such questions as: Could these data patterns have come about through chance factors or do these different patterns of data indicate a real or factual difference? When we arrange the data to show association between two characteristics, is the association shown a real or factual association or could it have arisen by the operation of chance factors?

Chi square is a convenient statistical technique which gives us an answer (in terms of probability) to such questions. In the following analyses we have used a probability significance level of 0.05 or less as our measure of reality. In other words, when we say that the data shows a significant pattern or relationship, we are saying the probability is at least 95 out of a 100 that there is a real association or pattern of relationship. However, when we say that the data shows no significant association or pattern we are merely saying that the data we have gives us no basis for any stronger conclusion. Specifically, we are not saying that there is no association or pattern but merely that our data does not indicate it. If it exists, when the data patterns are clearcut, we can give a positive answer. When the data patterns are not clearcut, we can only suspend judgement by saying there is no indication of significance or reality.

Data from the questionnaire were analyzed to determine their association with respondents' activity indices. The activity index (Appendix 2) measures respondents' conservatism or militancy with respect to direct social action by industry. We are interested, for example, in finding out whether a respondents' conservatism or militancy is related to the level of his position. The light that chi square analyses of the data throws on such questions is discussed below.

Activity Index Analyses

The basic question is whether respondents who differed in one characteristic (e.g. perception of change, level of position, etc.) also differed in their conservatism or militancy with respect to direct social action by industry (their activity index). Conservatism or militancy were defined in terms of quantitative activity indices rather than implying a specific constellation of attitudes. Thus, "conservative" for purposes of our analysis means that an individual's activity index is in the lower half of the indices when they are arranged in order of numerical size. "Militant" correspondingly means that a person's activity index falls in the upper half.

Chi square analyses were made comparing the two companies overall with respect to conservatism or militancy of respondents. Comparative analyses were also made of the divisions within each company.

When the service company and the manufacturing company were compared overall, the data showed no significant difference between them with respect to respondents' activity indices. In both companies there was approximately a 50-50 split between respondents with low (conservative) activity indices and high (militant) activity indices.

Analysis comparing divisions within each company added to this picture. Comparison of the units within the service company agreed with the company's overall pattern: approximately a 50-50 split of respondents who were conservative and militant. Comparison of divisions within the manufacturing company, however, showed real variation in attitudes among different divisions. Respondents in Divisions H and J displayed a high proportion of conservatives, 61 and 74 percent respectively. Divisions M and T showed only 39 and 43 percent conservative while Division S respondents had only 26 percent conservatives.

There was a significant association shown by comparison of different cultural/racial backgrounds with respect to conservatism and militancy. This came out of the data from black and white respondents. There are no conclusions with respect to other cultural/racial backgrounds because of insufficient data. Activity indices of white respondents showed 55 percent conservative and 45 percent militant with respect to direct social action by industry. Black respondents, however, were shown as 27 percent conservative and 72 percent militant.

The variation in percentage of conservative and militant was significantly different according to level of position. Militant orientation toward direct social action by industry showed a direct increase as the level of position rose. Hourly Paid respondents showed only 41 percent militant, Foreman/Supervisor 48 percent, Professional Staff 58 percent, and Managers 69 percent.

For ten of the twenty organizational processes studied chi square analysis indicated a significant association between a respondent's conservative or militant attitude toward direct social action by industry and his perception of change as well as judgement of change as a benefit or loss. Table 1 summarizes these associations for the ten process variables.

Listed in the footnote to Table 1 are the ten process variables for which chi square analysis revealed no such association. However, we emphasize that this lack of association merely says that our data did not reveal any such association between attitude toward social action and perception of change. We cannot say that such an association does or does not exist; all we can do is suspend judgement and say that our data is inadequate to make a definite decision.

Looking at the ten process variables where the association between social attitudes and perception of change was significant, we find some interesting relations. Table 2 summarize the differences in percentage points between conservatives and militants for each process variable.

Table 1

Perception of Change and Attitude Toward Direct Social Action

(Percentages for Statistically Significant Variables)

	Perception of Change (%)					
	Better		Worse		No Change	
Process Variables**	Con*	Mil*	Con*	Mil*	Con*	Mil*
Communication	55	76	14	3	31	21
Teamwork	45	61	13	6	42	33
Getting Along with People	56	69	16	5	28	26
Personal Achievement	52	60	8	2	40	38
Favoritism	21	27	28	16	51	57
Fairness in Assigning Work	33	39	24	11	43	50
Hiring Practices	46	76	32	11	22	13
Promotion	43	62	24	5	33	33
Money for Training and Education	68	85	10	1	22	14
Community Relations	61	72	14	7	25	21

*Con = respondents whose attitudes toward direct social action by industry were conservative (low activity index)

*Mil = respondents whose attitudes toward direct social action by industry were militant (high activity index)

**This list includes only those process variables where the chi square analysis indicated that response patterns were significantly associated with respondents' conservative-militant orientation (activity index). Other process variables for which chi square analysis showed no significant association with the activity index were: Productivity, Judging Work, Concern for Individual Welfare, Talking to Higher Management, Trust, Reaction to New Behavior or Dress, Layoff Processes, Setting Pay Rates, Red Tape and Grapevine.

Table 2

Percentage Points Difference Between Conservatives and Militants Who Agree on Their Perception of Change

	Percentage Points Difference Between Conservatives and Militants* Who Perceived Change As --		
Process Variables	Better	Worse	No Change
Communication	21	- 11	- 10
Teamwork	16	- 7	- 9
Getting Along With People	13	- 11	- 2
Personal Achievement	8	- 6	- 2
Favoritism	6	- 12	6
Fairness in Assigning Work	6	- 13	7
Hiring Practices	30	- 21	- 9
Promotion	19	- 19	0
Money for Training and Education	17	- 9	- 8
Community Relations	11	- 7	- 4

* Militant proportion minus conservative proportion

Consistently for all ten process variables respondents with militant attitudes (high activity index) perceived change as better more often than did respondents with conservative attitudes who agreed with them.

Conversely, the proportion of conservatives who perceived change as a loss is consistently greater than the proportion of militants who did not approve of the change. In the case of those who perceived change as benefit, the difference in proportion of conservatives and militants who saw change as better is most striking for change in Hiring Practices (a difference of thirty percentage points). Communication and Promotion were the process variables with the next largest differences between proportions of conservatives and militants both of whom perceived these processes as improved. In order of percentage points difference between conservatives and militants, the remaining process variables were: Money for Training and Education, Teamwork, Getting Along with People, Community Relations, Personal Achievement, Favoritism, and Fairness in Assigning Work.

The pattern of difference between conservatives and militants who saw the changes as loss was somewhat different. The difference in percentage points was not as striking since in most cases there were, of course, smaller proportions involved. In order of difference in percentage points the process variables were: Hiring, Promotion, Fairness in Assigning Work, Favoritism, Communication, Getting Along with People, Money for Training and Education, Teamwork, Community Relations, and Personal Achievement.

Consideration of conservatives and militants who perceived no change does not disclose the consistency displayed by those who perceived change (for the better or worse). Thus, conservatives perceived no change more often than militants in the process variables of: Communication, Teamwork, Personal Achievement, Hiring Practices, Money for Training and Education, and Community Relations. Militants were more likely than conservatives to perceive no change in the process variables of: Getting Along with People, Favoritism, and Fairness in Assigning Work. On the remaining process variable, Promotion, the proportions of conservatives and militants perceiving no change were identical.

Description of Sample and Methodology

Questionnaires were obtained from 410 respondents. Of these 398 was the largest number sufficiently complete to use for most data. Thirty-nine percent (154) of the persons who submitted questionnaires were also interviewed. The actual percentage interviewed may be slightly larger since there was occasional misunderstanding of this question. Persons who received the questionnaire and filled it out before being interviewed had usually indicated they were not interviewed. Some of these answers may not have been caught and corrected by the interviewer.

In the manufacturing company, persons in a division which was not included in our original sample became interested in the survey and desired to participate. It was agreed this would provide additional information of value, so questionnaires were obtained from them, but no interviewing was done in this division.

The following tables show the distribution of the sample by the characteristics of: Years in Company, Cultural/Racial Background, and Level of Position.

Table 1

Years in Company - Characteristics of Sample

	Percentages		All Companies	
Years	Co. X	Co. Y	%	No.
Less than 1	19	3	8	32
1 - 5	49	47	48	191
6 - 10	15	20	19	74
11 - 15	7	19	14	59
Over 15	10	11	11	42
Total	100	100	100	398

Table 2

Cultural/Racial Background - Characteristics of Sample

Background	Percentages: Co. X	Percentages: Co. Y	All Companies: %	All Companies: No.
White	62	81	74	297
Black	31	19	23	91
Other	7	--	3	10
Total	100	100	100	398

Table 3

Level of Position - Characteristics of Sample

Level	Percentages: Co. X	Percentages: Co. Y	All Companies: %	All Companies: No.
Hourly Paid	35	50	45	178
Foreman/Supervisor	20	16	18	70
Professional Staff	17	16	16	64
Manager	11	15	14	55
Other	17	3	7	31
Total	100	100	100	398

As the above tables show, the sample included all categories of the characteristics Years in Company and Level of Position. With respect to Cultural/Racial Background, the sample includes only a few others than persons who classified themselves as black or white.

The sample was determined in cooperation with an advisory council which included representatives of the participating companies. This council helped us decide what divisions of each company would be most likely to provide data relevant to the study. They also assisted us to obtain the necessary legitimation of our activities within each company. Project staff worked with the management of each division to establish